arXiv:1001.5093v1 [math.CV] 28 Jan 2010

A general method of weights in the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem

Tran Vu Khanh

Supervisor: **Giuseppe Zampieri**

A Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in front of the Committee composed by

Joseph J. Kohn (President)

Jeffery D. Mc.Neal

Emil J. Straube

Università degli Studi di Padova

www.Math.UniPD.it
Dipartimento di Matematica Pura ed Applicata

December 2009

Abstract

This thesis deals with Partial Differential Equations in Several Complex Variables and especially focuses on a general estimate for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem on a domain which is q-pseudoconvex or q-pseudoconcave at a boundary point z_0. Generalizing Property (P) by [C84], we define Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ at z_0. This property yields the estimate

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k \qquad \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u\|^2 \le c(\|\bar\partial u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial^* u\|^2 + \|u\|^2) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|^2_{-1}$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar\Omega)^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$ where U is a neighborhood of z_0. We want to point out that under a suitable choice of f and $\mathcal{M}$, $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ is the subelliptic, superlogarithmic, compactness and subelliptic multiplier estimate.

The thesis also aims at exhibiting some relevant classes of domains which enjoy Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ and at discussing recent literature on the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem in the framework of this property.

Sunto

Questa tesi tratta di Equazioni alle Derivate Parziali in Più Variabili Complesse e ha come obiettivo principale quello di stabilire una stima generale per il problema $\bar\partial$-Neumann su un dominio che è q-pseudoconvesso o q-pseudoconcavo in corrispondenza di un punto di bordo z_0. Generalizzando la Proprietà (P) di [C84], si introduce la Proprietà $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ in z_0. Essa dà luogo alla stima

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k \qquad \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u\|^2 \le c(\|\bar\partial u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial^* u\|^2 + \|u\|^2) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|^2_{-1}$$

per ogni $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar\Omega)^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$ ove U è un intorno di z_0. È il caso di osservare che per opportune scelte di f e di $\mathcal{M}$, la stima $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ coincide con le principali stime della letteratura quali quelle subellittiche, superlogaritmiche, di compattezza e infine quelle di moltiplicatore subellittico.

La tesi ha anche l'obiettivo di esibire delle classi rilevanti di domini che godono della Proprietà $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ e di discutere letteratura recente sul problema $\bar\partial$-Neumann nel quadro di questa proprietà.

Acknowledgements

When I started the study of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem, I would never have dreamed of having Joseph J. Kohn as President of my Ph.D. Committee. I knew from the beginning his extraordinary reputation in our community. What I learned along the way is the continuous presence of his scientific discoveries in my research work. He is really a master to me.

I am indebted to Emil J. Straube whose research has recently attracted my attention. I have also profited from his advice and the fruitful exchanges we have had.

Finally, Jeffery D. McNeal's work has greatly excited my interest. I thank him for joining the Committee.

Further Acknowledgements

It is a great pleasure to thank my advisor, Giuseppe Zampieri, for his discussions and guidance in directing my research. I am deeply indebted to him for initiating me to the field of Complex Analysis and CR Geometry. I sincerely appreciate his support over the years and I feel immensely lucky to have had such an advisor.

I would like to thank Luca Baracco for many fruitful discussions. I am also indebted to Dmitri Zaitsev for his advice.

I would like to dedicate my special thanks to the Foundation CARIPARO which offered me a three years scholarship. In addition, I would like to thank all professors of the Department of Mathematics of the University of Padova for their interesting lectures.

I would like to thank all friends who have supported me during the time I spent in the Graduate School.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for all the support and encouragement they have given me during these past three years. I would especially like to thank my wife, Uyen Phuong.

Contents

Abstract **iii**

Riassunto **v**

Acknowledgements **vii**

Contents **xii**

1 Introduction **1**
- 1.1 The $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem . . . 1
- 1.2 The $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate . . . 2
- 1.3 How the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate mathces the literature . . . 6
- 1.4 The main theorems . . . 8

2 Background **13**
- 2.1 Terminology and notations . . . 13
- 2.2 The basic estimate . . . 17
- 2.3 q-pseudoconvex/concave domains . . . 22
- 2.4 Tangential pseudodifferential operators . . . 23

3 $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$-estimate : a sufficient condition **29**
- 3.1 Reduction to the boundary . . . 29
- 3.2 Estimate on the strip . . . 31
- 3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.10 . . . 34
- 3.4 Some remarks about $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ . . . 39

4 The $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate on the boundary **43**
- 4.1 Definitions and notations . . . 43
- 4.2 Basic microlocal estimates on $b\Omega$ . . . 45
- 4.3 Basic microlocal estimates on Ω^+ and Ω^- . . . 49
- 4.4 The equivalence of $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate on Ω and $b\Omega$ . . . 54

5 Geometric and analytic consequences of $(f\text{-}M)^k$ estimate 59
5.1 Estimates with a 1-parameter family of cutoff functions 59
5.2 Kohn's proof of local regularity 64
5.3 Catlin's proof of the necessary condition 64
5.4 Mc Neal's proof of lower bounds for the Bergman metric 68
5.5 How the Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ follows from the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate . 75

6 Global regularity 79
6.1 Compactness estimate and global regularity 79
6.2 Failure of compactness estimate in presence of global regularity . 81
6.3 Weak compactness estimate and global regularity 85

7 The Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ in some classes of domains 91
7.1 Domains which satisfy the $Z(k)$ condition 91
7.2 q-decoupled-pseudoconvex/concave domains 92
7.3 Subelliptic estimates for regular coordinate domains 97

Bibliography 103

Vita 109

Chapter 1

Introduction

The $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem is probably the most important and natural example of a non-elliptic boundary value problem. It owes its importance to the Cauchy-Riemann system from which it originates. The main tools to prove regularity of solutions of this problem are various L_2-estimates such as subelliptic, superlogarithmic, compactness estimates just to mention a few. In this thesis, we introduce a general estimate, that we call $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$, whose principal related results are Theorems 1.10, 1.13 and 1.14. As an introduction, we give a brief description of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem, for whose detailed account we refer to [FK72].

1.1 The $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem

Let Ω be a bounded domain of $\mathbb{C}^n$ with smooth boundary denoted by $b\Omega$. Let $L_2^{h,k}(\Omega)$ be the space of square-integrable (h,k)-forms on Ω. We have a densely defined complex of operators $\bar\partial$ with adjoint $\bar\partial^*$

$$L_2^{h,k-1}(\Omega) \underset{\bar\partial^*}{\overset{\bar\partial}{\rightleftarrows}} L_2^{h,k}(\Omega) \underset{\bar\partial^*}{\overset{\bar\partial}{\rightleftarrows}} L_2^{h,k+1}(\Omega). \tag{1.1}$$

We define $\mathcal{H}^{h,k} \subset L_2^{h,k}(\Omega)$ by

$$\mathcal{H}^{h,k} = \{u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*) \big| \bar\partial u = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar\partial^* u = 0\}. \tag{1.2}$$

The *$\bar\partial$-Neumann problem* for (h,k)-forms can be stated as follows: given $\alpha \in L_2^{h,k}(\Omega)$ with $\alpha \perp \mathcal{H}^{h,k}$, does there exist $u \in L^{h,k}(\Omega)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} (\bar\partial\bar\partial^* + \bar\partial^*\bar\partial)u = \alpha \\ u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial) \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*) \\ \bar\partial u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*), \bar\partial^* u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial)? \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

Observe that the solution u to (1.3) under the constraint $u \perp \mathcal{H}^{h,k}$ is unique, if it exists. We denote this solution by $N\alpha$. If a solution to (1.3) exists for all $\alpha \perp \mathcal{H}^{h,k}$, then we extend the operator N to a linear operator on $L_2^{h,k}(\Omega)$ by setting

$$N\alpha = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathcal{H}^{h,k} \\ u & \text{if } \alpha \perp \mathcal{H}^{h,k}. \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

Then N is bounded self adjoint. Furthermore, if $\bar\partial\alpha = 0$, then from (1.3) we obtain $\bar\partial\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N\alpha = 0$ and taking inner product with $\bar\partial N\alpha$ we get $\|\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N\alpha\|^2 = 0$ and hence $\bar\partial^*\bar\partial N\alpha = 0$. Thus we see from (1.3) that if $\bar\partial\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha \perp \mathcal{H}^{h,k}$, then $\alpha = \bar\partial\bar\partial^* N\alpha$. It then follows that $u = \bar\partial^* N\alpha$ is the unique solution to the $\bar\partial$*-problem*

$$\begin{cases} \bar\partial u = \alpha, \\ u \text{ is orthogonal to } \operatorname{Ker}\bar\partial. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

The $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem is a non-elliptic boundary value problem; in fact, the Laplacian $\Box = \bar\partial\bar\partial^* + \bar\partial^*\bar\partial$ itself is elliptic but the boundary conditions which are imposed by the membership to $\text{Dom}(\Box)$, that is, the second and third line of (1.3), are not. The main interest relies in the *regularity* at the boundary for this problem, that is, in stating under which condition u inherits from α the smoothness at the boundary $b\Omega$ (it certainly does in the interior). The regularity of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator is defined as follows

Definition 1.1.

(i) *Global regularity :* if $\alpha \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)$ then $N\alpha \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)$.

(ii) *Local regularity :* if $\alpha \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar\Omega)$ then $N\alpha \in C^\infty(U' \cap \bar\Omega)$ where the sets $U' \subset U$ range in a system of neighborhoods of a point $z_0 \in \bar\Omega$.

One of the main tools used in investigating the local (resp. global) regularity at the boundary of the solutions of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem consists in certain a priori estimates such as subelliptic, superlogarithmic (resp. compactness) estimates. In this thesis we introduce the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate which is comprehensive of all these estimates.

1.2 The $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate

In order to define $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$, some preliminary material is required.

For quantities A and B we use the notion $A \lesssim B$ to mean $A \leq cB$ for some constant $c > 0$ which is independent of relevant parameters. We write $A \cong B$ to mean $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$. For functions f and g, we use the notation $f \gg g$ to mean that $\frac{f}{g}$ is $+\infty$ at $+\infty$.

Let Ω be a smooth domain locally defined in a neighborhood of boundary point z_0. Throughout this thesis we assume that z_0 is the origin. For a neighborhood U of z_0, fix a smooth real-valued function r such that

$$\Omega \cap U = \{z \in U : r(z) < 0\}; \tag{1.6}$$

we also require that $|\partial r| = 1$ on $b\Omega$. We take a local orthonormal basis of $(1,0)$ forms $\omega_1, ..., \omega_n = \partial r$ and a dual basis of (1,0) vector fields $L_1, ..., L_n$; thus $L_1, ..., L_{n-1}$ generate $T^{1,0}(U \cap b\Omega)$. For $\phi \in C^2(U)$, we denote by ϕ_{ij} the coefficients of $\partial\bar{\partial}\phi$ in this basis.

Let $\lambda_1(z) \leq ... \leq \lambda_{n-1}(z)$ be the eigenvalues of $(r_{jk}(z))_{j,k=1}^{n-1}$. We take a pair of indices $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ and $0 \leq q_o \leq n-1$ such that $q \neq q_o$. We assume that there is a bundle $\mathcal{V}^{q_o} \in T^{1,0}b\Omega$ of rank q_o with smooth coefficients (that by reordering can be supposed to coincide with span $\{L_1, ..., L_{q_o}\}$) such that q_o

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} \lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} r_{jj} \geq 0 \text{ on } U \cap b\Omega. \tag{1.7}$$

Here we conventionally set $\sum_{j=1}^{q_o} \cdot \equiv 0$ if $q_o = 0$.

Definition 1.2.

(i) If $q > q_o$ we say that Ω is *q-pseudoconvex* at z_0.

(ii) If $q < q_o$ we say that Ω is *q-pseudoconcave* at z_0.

The q-pseudoconvexity/concavity is said to be *strong* when (1.7) holds as strict inequality.

The notion of q-pseudoconvexity was used in [A07] and [Z00] to prove the existence of $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})^k$ solutions to the equation $\bar{\partial}u = f$. Though the notion of q-pseudoconcavity is formally symmetric to q-pseudoconvexity, it is useless in the existence problem. The reason is intrinsic. Existence is a “global” problem but bounded domains are never globally q-pseudoconcave. Instead, in the present thesis, we deal with various estimates of local type such as subelliptic or superlogarithmic. Owing to the local nature of these estimates and the related local regularity of $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem, this is the first occurrence where q-pseudoconcavity comes successfully into play. Moreover, local estimates on a pseudoconcave domain play a leading role in the study the $\bar\partial$ or $\bar\partial_b$-Neumann problem on an annulus or a hypersurface.

Remark 1.3. If Ω is q-pseudoconvex at z_0, then Ω is also k-pseudoconvex for any $k \geq q$. Similarly, if Ω is q-pseudoconcave at z_0, then Ω is also k-pseudoconcave for any $k \leq q$.

Remark 1.4. Definition 1.2 is a generalization of the usual pseudoconvexity or pseudoconcavity as well as of the celebrated condition $Z(q)$ (cf. [FK72]). In fact, for $q_o = 0$ and $q = 1$, 1-pseudoconvexity is the usual pseudoconvexity. Similarly, for $q_o = n-1$ and $q = n-2$, $(n-1)$-pseudoconcavity is the usual pseudoconcavity. Moreover, if Ω satisfies condition $Z(q)$ at z_0, that is, the Levi form has at least $n-q$ positive eigenvalues or at least $q+1$ negative eigenvalues, then Ω is strongly q-pseudoconvex or strongly q-pseudoconcave at z_0.

We denote by $\mathcal{A}^{h,k}$ the space of smooth (h,k)-forms in $\bar\Omega$. Throughout this thesis we only deal with $(0,k)$-forms since the extension from type $(0,k)$ to type (h,k) is trivial. We use the notation

$$C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar\Omega)^k = \{u \in \mathcal{A}^{0,k} \big| \operatorname{supp}(u) \subset U\}.$$

If $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar\Omega)^k$, then u can be written as

$$u = \sum_{|J|=k}{}' u_J \bar\omega_J, \tag{1.8}$$

where $\bar\omega_J = \bar\omega_{j_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \bar\omega_{j_k}$ and where $J = \{j_1, ..., j_k\}$ is a ordered multiindex. Also, $\sum'$ denotes summation over strictly increasing index sets. If J decomposes as $J = jK$, then we write $u_{jK} = \epsilon^{jK}_J u_J$ where $\epsilon^{jK}_J u_J$ is the sign of the permutation $(iK) \overset{\sim}{\to} J$. Under the choice of a basis of $(1,0)$-forms in which $\omega_n = \partial r$, we check readily that $u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$ if and only if $u_{nK}|_{b\Omega} = 0$ for any K.

We define the *function multiplier* $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}^{0,0}$, by

$$\mathcal{M}u := |\mathcal{M}||u|. \tag{1.9}$$

We define the 1-*form multiplier* $\mathcal{M} = \sum_j \mathcal{M}_j \bar\omega_j \in \mathcal{A}^{0,1}$ over a q-pseudoconvex/concave domain Ω at z_0 by

$$\mathcal{M}u := \sqrt{\Big| \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \Big|\sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{M}_j u_{jK}\Big|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} |\mathcal{M}_j|^2 |u|^2 \Big|}. \tag{1.10}$$

For $z_0 \in b\Omega$, we choose the defining function r as the last coordinate and supplement it to a full system $(x, r) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ of so-called *special boundary coordinates* in a neigborhood U of z_0. In this situation, the x_j's are the *tangential coordinates* and r the *normal coordinate.* Denote by ξ the dual variables of x and define $x \cdot \xi = \sum x_i \xi_j$ and $|\xi|^2 = \sum \xi_j^2$.

For $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$, we define $\tilde{\varphi}$, the *tangential Fourier transform* of φ, by

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} e^{-ix\cdot\xi} \varphi(x, r) dx.$$

We denote by $\Lambda_\xi = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ the standard "tangential" elliptic symbol of order 1 and by Λ the operator with symbol Λ_ξ. We define a class of functions $\mathcal{F}$ by

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f \in C^\infty([1, +\infty)) \Big| 0 \le f(t) \lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}}; f'(t) \ge 0 \text{ and } \left|f^{(m)}(t)\right| \lesssim \Big|\frac{f^{(m-1)}(t)}{t}\Big|, \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}.$$

Notice that for any of the choices $f(t) = 1$, $f = (\log t)^s$ or $f = t^\epsilon$, $\epsilon \le \frac{1}{2}$, we have that $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

For $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we define the operator $f(\Lambda)$ by

$$f(\Lambda)\varphi(x, r) = (2\pi)^{-2n+1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} e^{ix\cdot\xi} f(\Lambda_\xi) \tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r) d\xi, \tag{1.11}$$

where $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$.

We define the energy form Q on $C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$ by

$$Q(u, v) = (\bar{\partial}u, \bar{\partial}v) + (\bar{\partial}^*u, \bar{\partial}^*v) + (u, v).$$

We are now ready to define the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate.

Definition 1.5. Let Ω be q-pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconcave) at $z_0 \in b\Omega$. Then, the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem is said to satisfy the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ *estimate* at $z_0 \in b\Omega$ if there exist a positive constant $C_\mathcal{M}$ and a neighborhood U of z_0 such that

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k \qquad ||f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u||^2 \lesssim Q(u, u) + C_\mathcal{M}\|u\|_{-1}^2, \tag{1.12}$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$ where $k \ge q$ (resp. $k \le q$).

Remark 1.6. If $\mathcal{M}$ is a bounded constant, then we can assume that $C_\mathcal{M} = 0$.

Remark 1.7. If Ω is pseudoconvex at z_0 and $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^{k_o}$ holds for some $k_o \ge 1$, then $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ holds for any $k \ge k_o$. Similarly, If Ω is pseudoconcave at z_0 and $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^{k_o}$ holds for some $k_o \le n-2$, then $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ holds for any $k \le k_o$.

We simply say that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ holds when the definition applies. We remark that if $f(|\xi|) \cong |\xi|^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then the operator $\mathcal{M}$ has to be bounded since the best estimate at the boundary is the $\frac{1}{2}$-subelliptic estimate.

1.3 How the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate mathces the literature

We want to point our attention to the choice of f and $\mathcal{M}$ in relevant cases and review some results concerning these estimates.

1) For $f(|\xi|) = |\xi|^\epsilon$, $0 < \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and for $\mathcal{M} = 1$, the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate becomes the *subellipitic estimate*

$$|||u|||_\epsilon^2 \lesssim Q(u,u). \tag{1.13}$$

Here $|||\cdot|||_\epsilon$ is the *tangential* ϵ-Sobolev norm. When the domain Ω is pseudoconvex, a great deal of work has been done about subelliptic estimates. The most general results concerning this problem have been obtained in [K79] and [C87].

- In [K79], Kohn gave a sufficient condition for subellipticity over pseudoconvex domains with real analytic boundary by introducing a sequence of ideals of subelliptic multipliers.
- In [C87], Catlin proved, regardless whether $b\Omega$ is real analytic or not, that subelliptic estimates hold for k-forms at z_0 if and only if the D'Angelo type $D_k(z_0)$ is finite. Catlin applies the method of weight functions used earlier by Hörmander [H66]. One step in Catlins proof is the following reduction:

  Theorem 1.8. *Suppose that* $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ *is a pseudoconvex domain defined by* $\Omega = \{r < 0\}$*, let* $z_0 \in b\Omega$*, and let* U *be a neighborhood of* z_0*. Suppose that for all* $\delta > 0$*, there is a smooth real-valued function* Φ^δ *satisfying the properties:*

$$\begin{cases} |\Phi^\delta| \leq 1 \text{ on } U, \\ \Phi^\delta_{ij} \geq 0 \text{ on } U, \\ \sum_{ij=1}^n \Phi^\delta_{ij} u_i \bar{u}_j \gtrsim \delta^{-2\epsilon}|u|^2 \text{ on } U \cap \{-\delta < r \leq 0\}, \end{cases} \tag{1.14}$$

  where the matrix Φ^δ_{ij} *represents the form* $\partial\bar\partial\Phi^\delta$ *in the chosen basis* $\{\omega_j\}_j$*. Then, we have a subelliptic estimate of order* ϵ *at* z_0*.*

However, not much is known in the case when the domain is not necessarily pseudoconvex except from the results related to the celebrated $Z(k)$ condition which characterizes the existence of subelliptic estimates of index $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ according to Hörmander [H65] and Folland-Kohn [FK72]. Some further results, mainly related to the case of forms of top degree $n-1$, are due to Ho [Ho85].

The basic theorem of Kohn and Nirenberg [KN65] shows that local regularity is a consequence of a subelliptic estimate. In fact, if a subelliptic estimate of order ϵ holds for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem on a neighborhood U of $z_0 \in b\Omega$, then $\alpha|_U \in H_s(U)^k$ implies $N\alpha|_{U'} \in H_{s+2\epsilon}(U')^k$ for $U' \subset\subset U$; here $H_s(U)^k$ denotes the space of k-forms with coefficients in the H_s-Sobolev space of order s.

2) For $f(|\xi|) = \log|\xi|$ and $\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ implies the *superlogarithmic estimate*

$$||\log(\Lambda)u||^2 \lesssim \epsilon(\|\bar\partial u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial^* u\|^2) + C_\epsilon\|u\|^2. \tag{1.15}$$

Superlogarithmic estimates were first introduced by Kohn in [K02]. He proved superlogarithmic estimates for the tangential Kohn-Laplace operator $\Box_b$ on certain pseudoconvex CR manifolds and using them he established local regularity of $\Box_b$ and of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem. These estimates are established under the assumption that subellipticity degenerates in certain specified ways.

3) For $f(|\xi|) \equiv 1$ and $\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ implies the *compactness estimate*

$$||u||^2 \lesssim \epsilon(\|\bar\partial u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial^* u\|^2) + C_\epsilon\|u\|^2_{-1}. \tag{1.16}$$

By its definition, the compactness estimate in (1.16) is a local property. Roughly speaking, the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N on Ω is compact if and only if every boundary point has a neighborhood U such that the corresponding $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator on $U \cap \Omega$ is compact. A classical theorem of Kohn and Nirenberg [KN65] asserts that compactness of N (as an operator from $L_2(\Omega)$ into itself) implies global regularity in the sense of preservation of Sobolev regularity.

Catlin [C84] introduced Property (P) and showed that it implies a compactness estimate for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem. A pseudoconvex domain Ω has Property (P) if for every positive number M there exists a plurisubhamonic function Φ^M in $C^\infty(\Omega)$, bounded between 0 and 1, whose complex Hessian has all its eigenvalues bounded from below by M on $b\Omega$, that is

$$\sum_{ij=1}^{n} \frac{\partial^2\Phi^M}{\partial z_i \partial \bar z_j} w_i \bar w_j \geq M|w|^2, \text{ for } z \in b\Omega, w \in \mathbb{C}^n. \tag{1.17}$$

Compactness is completely understood on (bounded) locally convexifiable domains. On such domains, the following are equivalent [FS98], [FS01] :

(i) N_k is compact,

(ii) the boundary $b\Omega$ satisfies property (P),

(iii) the boundary contains no k-dimensional analytic variety.

In general, however, the situation is not understood at all.

5) For $f(|\xi|) \equiv 1$ and $\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \overline{r^{\epsilon}_{z_i\bar z_j} r_{\bar z_i}} d\bar z_j$ where r^{ϵ} and r are defining functions with $|\nabla r^{\epsilon}| \cong 1$ on $b\Omega$, we have that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ is equivalent to

$$\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \|\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \overline{r^{\epsilon}_{z_i\bar z_j} r_{\bar z_i}} u_{jK}\|^2 \lesssim \epsilon(\|\bar\partial u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial^* u\|^2) + C_\epsilon \|u\|^2_{-1}, \tag{1.18}$$

for any $u = \sum_{|J|=k}{}' u_J d\bar z_J \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$.

The estimate (1.18) was introduced by Straube in [S08]. He showed that if (1.18) holds for all $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$, then the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N_k on k-forms is exactly regular in Sobolev norms, that is

$$\|N_k u\|_s \le C_s \|u\|_s$$

for any integer $s \ge 0$ and any $u \in H_s(\Omega)^k$. Notice that the estimate (1.18) is weaker than the compactness estimate.

6) For $f(|\xi|) = |\xi|^\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}^{0,0}$ (resp. $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{A}^{1,0}$), we have that the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$-estimate can be written as

$$|||\mathcal{M}u|||^2_\epsilon \lesssim Q(u,u). \tag{1.19}$$

One calls $\mathcal{M}$ a *subelliptic multiplier* (resp. *subelliptic vector-multiplier*). Kohn [K79] introduced the theory of subelliptic multipliers and subelliptic vector-multipliers to obtain subelliptic estimates on a real analytic domain. To prove subelliptic estimates, he searched for a nonzero constant function belonging to the collection of multipliers.

1.4 The main theorems

The first goal of this thesis, we exploit here the full strength of Catlin's method to study the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate on a q-pseudoconvex or q-pseudoconcave domain. These results are related to joint work with G. Zampieri in [KZ08a],[KZ08b] and [KZ09a].

For a form u, we consider the decomposition $u = (u^\tau, u^\nu)$ where the *tangential component* u^τ collects the coefficients u_J with $n \notin J$ and the *normal component* u^ν those with $n \in J$. Denote by S_δ the strip $\{z \in \Omega | -\delta < r < 0\}$. Generalizing conditions (1.14) in Theorem 1.8 and Property (P) in (1.17), we define

Definition 1.9. We say that Ω satisfies *Property* $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ at the boundary point $z_0 \in b\Omega$, if there is a neighborhood U of z_0 and a family of real valued $C^2(U)$ weights $\Phi := \Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}$ such that we have on $S_\delta \cap U$

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k \qquad \begin{cases} |\Phi| \lesssim 1 \\ \sum\limits'_{|K|=k-1} \sum\limits_{ij=1}^{n} \Phi_{ij} u^\tau_{iK} \bar{u}^\tau_{jK} & -\sum\limits_{j=1}^{q_o} \Phi_{jj} |u^\tau|^2 \\ & \gtrsim f(\delta^{-1})^2 |\mathcal{M} u^\tau|^2 + \sum\limits_{j=1}^{q_o} |L_j(\Phi) u^\tau|^2, \end{cases} \tag{1.20}$$

for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k$.

Our result is the following

Theorem 1.10. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be q-pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconcave) and satisfy Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ at $z_0 \in b\Omega$; then the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$-estimate holds at z_0 for $k \geq q$ (resp. $k \leq q$).*

Observe that the condition on the family $\{\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}\}$ in our Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ is simpler than condition (1.14) in Theorem 1.8 and Property (P) in (1.17).

The main idea for proving Theorem 1.10 follows from Catlin [C87] combined with some modifications contained in [KZ08a] and [KZ08b].

We remark that our Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ only deals with the u^τ-tangential component of u. We first get the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate for u replaced by u^τ. On the other hand, for the normal component u^ν of u, one readily proves the elliptic estimate $\|u^\nu\|^2_1 \lesssim Q(u,u)$. Thus the full u enjoys the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate.

On a real hypersurface M of $\mathbb{C}^n$, $\bar\partial$ induces the *tangential Cauchy-Riemann* operator $\bar\partial_b$. Let $\bar\partial_b^*$ be the L_2-adjoint of $\bar\partial_b$ and $\Box_b = \bar\partial_b \bar\partial_b^* + \bar\partial_b^* \bar\partial_b$, the induced Kohn-Laplacian. Let $(\cdot,\cdot)_b$ denote the inner L_2-product on M; for u, $v \in C^\infty_c(U \cap M)^k$, we denote the tangential energy by

$$Q_b(u,v) = (\bar\partial u, \bar\partial u)_b + (\bar\partial^* u, \bar\partial^* v)_b + (u,v)_b.$$

In the space of frequencies $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-1}$, we consider a conical smooth partition of the unity

$$\psi^+(\xi) + \psi^-(\xi) + \psi^0(\xi) = 1,$$

where $\operatorname{supp}\psi^{\pm} \subset \{\xi : \pm\xi_{2n-1} > |(\xi_1, ..., \xi_{2n-2})|\}$ and $\operatorname{supp}\psi^0 \subset \{\xi : |\xi_{2n-1}| < 2|(\xi_1, ..., \xi_{2n-2})|\}$. We consider the corresponding pseudodifferential decomposition of the identity

$$\Psi^+ + \Psi^- + \Psi^0 = \mathrm{id}.$$

Accordingly, for a form $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap M)^k$, we consider the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \zeta\Psi^+ u + \zeta\Psi^- u + \zeta\Psi^0 u \\ &=: u^+ + u^- + u^0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.21}$$

where ζ is a cut off in $C_c^\infty(U' \cap M)$ for $U' \supset\supset U$. Our estimates on M are defined as follows

Definition 1.11. Let M be a hypersurface; then a $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_b^k$ estimate holds for $(\bar\partial_b, \bar\partial_b^*)$ at $z_0 \in M$ if, in a neighborhood U of z_0, we have

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_b^k \qquad \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u\|_b^2 \lesssim Q_b(u,u) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|_{b,-1}^2,$$

for all $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap M)^k$. And a $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,+}^k$ (resp. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,-}^k$) estimate holds for $(\bar\partial_b, \bar\partial_b^*)$ at z_0 if the above holds with u replaced by u^+ (resp. u^-), that is,

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,+}^k \qquad \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^+\|_b^2 \lesssim Q_b(u^+,u^+) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u^+\|_{b,-1}^2$$

(resp.

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,-}^k \qquad \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^-\|_b^2 \lesssim Q_b(u^-,u^-) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u^-\|_{b,-1}^2 \quad).$$

Definition 1.12. The hypersurface M is said to be q-pseudoconvex if one of two sides $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus M$ is q-pseudoconvex.

We denote by $\Omega^+ = \{z \in U | r(z) < 0\}$ the q-pseudoconvex side of $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus M$ and by Ω^- the complementary side. By Remark 2.5 which follows, $\Omega^- = \{z \in U | -r(z) < 0\}$ is $(n-q-1)$-pseudoconcave. We use the notations $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{\Omega^\pm}^k$ in the obvious sense.

The second goal of this thesis is to state the equivalence of the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate on a domain and on its boundary.

Theorem 1.13. *Let M be a q-pseudoconvex hypersurface at z_0 and let $\Omega^\pm$ be the two sides of $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus M$ locally at $z_0 \in M$. Then, for any $k \geq q$, we have the following system of equivalences*

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{\Omega^+}^k \iff (f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,+}^k \iff (f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,-}^{n-1-k} \iff (f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{\Omega^-}^{n-1-k}. \tag{1.22}$$

Since $Q_b(u^0,u^0)\gtrsim \|u^0\|^2_{b,1}$, Theorem 1.13 implies that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k_b$ holds on M at z_0 if Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ and Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^{n-1-k}$ hold on Ω^+ at z_0.

The third goal of this thesis is the analysis of local problems which arise, on a bounded pseudoconvex domain, from the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate when $f\gg\log$ and $\mathcal{M}=1$. Among these we mention local regularity for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator, geometric necessary conditions, lower bounds for the Bergmann metric and the Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$.

Theorem 1.14. *Let Ω be a bounded pseudoconvex domain and let $z_0\in b\Omega$. Suppose that $(f\text{-}1)^1$ holds in a neighborhood U of z_0 with $f\gg\log$, that is, $\lim\limits_{\xi\to\infty}\dfrac{f(|\xi|)}{\log|\xi|}=+\infty$. Then,*

1. *The $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator is locally regular.*
2. *If, for an 1-dimensional complex analytic variety Z passing through z_0, $b\Omega$ has type $\le F$ along to Z at z_0 in the sense that*

   $$|r(z)|\lesssim F(|z-z_0|)\quad \text{for all } z\in Z \text{ sufficiently close to } z_0,$$

   then, for small δ and with F^* denoting the inverse function to F,

   $$\frac{f(\delta^{-1})}{\log(\delta^{-1})}\lesssim F^*(\delta^{-1})^{-1}.$$

3. *Given a constant $\eta>0$, there exists $U'\subset U$, so that for any $z\in U'\cap\Omega$ and any $X\in T^{1,0}_z\mathbb{C}^n$, the Bergman metric $B(z,X)$ is bounded from below by $|X|\dfrac{f}{\log}(\delta^{-1+\eta}(z))$, where $\delta(z)$ is the distance of z to $b\Omega$.*
4. *Given a constant η, there exist $U'\subset U$ and constant $\delta_0>0$, so that Property $(\tilde f\text{-}1\text{-}P)^1$ holds in U' with $\tilde f(\delta^{-1})=\dfrac{f}{\log^{\frac32+\eta}}(\delta^{-1+\eta})$, $0<\delta\le\delta_0$.*

As for the global problem, it is well known that the compactness estimate implies global regularity for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator. In this thesis we give an example in which compactness estimate does not hold but, nonetheless, the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator is globally regular. This refines former work by Krantz [Kr88]. Moreover, we show that global regularity follows from an estimate which is weaker than compactness estimate according to Straube [S08].

The thesis also contains the discussion of Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ for some classes of domains such as domains satisfying $Z(k)$ as well as decoupled or regular coordinate domains.

The thesis is structured as follows. In Chapter 2, we give the background of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem over q-pseudoconvex/concave domains following the guidelines of Folland-Kohn [FK72] and Zampieri [Z08]. In Chapter 3, we introduce the method of weights and prove Theorem 1.10. This part is a development of Catlin [C84] and [C87]. In Chapter 4, we study, by microlocal tools, the relation between the $\bar\partial$-Neumann system and the tangential system and prove Theorem 1.13. The main references of this section are Kohn [K86] and Kohn [K02]. In Chapter 5, we combine the techniques by Kohn [K02] and Catlin [C83] to show that an $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate implies a local H_s estimate with a 1-parameter family of cutoff functions. This H_s estimate is the main tool for the proof of Theorem 1.14. The proof of the second (resp. third) part of Theorem 1.14 originates from [C83] (resp. [McN92]) but contains new ideas which are needed to handle domains which are no more of finite type. Global regularity is discussed in Chapter 6. In Chapter 7, we discuss Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ for decoupled domains and state optimal subelliptic estimates for regular coordinate domains (for whose detailed analysis we refer to [KZ08c]).

Chapter 2

Background

In this chapter, we provide most of the background which is needed to introduce the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem on a q-pseudoconvex/concave domain Ω at a point $z_0 \in b\Omega$.

2.1 Terminology and notations

For $z \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we denote by $\mathbb{C}T_z\mathbb{C}^n$ the complex-valued tangent vectors to $\mathbb{C}^n$ at z. We have the direct sum decomposition $\mathbb{C}T_z\mathbb{C}^n = T_z^{1,0}\mathbb{C}^n \oplus T_z^{0,1}\mathbb{C}^n$, where $T_z^{1,0}\mathbb{C}^n$ and $T_z^{0,1}\mathbb{C}^n$ denote the holomorphic and anti-holomorphic tangent vectors at z respectively.

Denote by $\mathcal{A}_z^{0,k}$ the space of $(0,k)$-forms at z and by $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_z$ the pairing of $\mathcal{A}_z^{0,k}$ with its dual space. We also denote by $\langle\ ,\ \rangle_z$ the inner product induced on $\mathcal{A}_z^{0,k}$ by the hermitian metric and by $|\ |_z$ the associated norm.

Let $L_1, ..., L_n$ be an orthonormal basis of $T^{1,0}\mathbb{C}^n$ in a neighborhood U of z_0; then, for $z \in U$, we have $\langle (L_i)_z, (L_j)_z\rangle_z = \delta_{ij}$ where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker symbol.

Let $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_n$ be the dual basis of (1,0)-forms on U, so that for each $z \in U$ we have $\langle (\omega_i)_z, (L_j)_z\rangle_z = \delta_{ij}$. We denote by $\bar L_1, \cdots, \bar L_n$ the conjugates of $L_1, \cdots, L_n$, respectively; these form an orthonormal basis of $T^{0,1}\mathbb{C}^n$ on U. Denote by $\bar\omega_1, \cdots, \bar\omega_n$, the conjugates of $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_n$ respectively; they are the local basis of (0,1)-forms on U which is dual to $\bar L_1, \cdots, \bar L_n$. In this basis, for any $\phi \in C^\infty(U)$, we can write

$$d\phi = \sum_{j=1}^n L_j(\phi)\omega_j + \sum_{j=1}^n \bar L_j(\phi)\bar\omega_j.$$

Then, one defines

$$\partial\phi = \sum_{j=1}^{n} L_j(\phi)\omega_j \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\partial}\phi = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \bar{L}_j(\phi)\bar{\omega}_j.$$

We set ϕ_{ij} to be the coefficients of $\partial\bar{\partial}\phi$ in the basis $\{\omega_j\}_j$, i.e.

$$\partial\bar{\partial}\phi = \sum_{ij} \phi_{ij}\omega_i \wedge \bar{\omega}_j. \tag{2.1}$$

For each $k = 1, ..., n$, let $\bar{c}_{ij}^k$ be the coefficients of the 2-forms $\partial\bar{\omega}_k$, that is,

$$\partial\bar{\omega}_k = \sum_{ij} \bar{c}_{ij}^k \omega_i \wedge \bar{\omega}_j.$$

Then ϕ_{ij} can be calculated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\bar{\partial}\phi &= \partial\Big(\sum_k \bar{L}_k(\phi)\bar{\omega}_k\Big) \\ &= \sum_{i,k} L_i\bar{L}_k(\phi)\omega^i \wedge \bar{\omega}^k + \sum_k \bar{L}_k(\phi)\sum_{i,j}\bar{c}_{ij}^k\omega_i \wedge \bar{\omega}_j \\ &= \sum_{i,j}\Big(L_i\bar{L}_j(\phi) + \sum_k \bar{c}_{ij}^k\bar{L}_k(\phi)\Big)\omega_i \wedge \bar{\omega}_j. \end{aligned}$$

From the fact that $\partial\bar{\partial} + \bar{\partial}\partial = 0$, we have

$$\phi_{ij} = L_i\bar{L}_j(\phi) + \sum_k \bar{c}_{ij}^k\bar{L}_k(\phi) = \bar{L}_jL_i(\phi) + \sum_k c_{ji}^k L_k(\phi). \tag{2.2}$$

From (2.2) we obtain

$$[L_i, \bar{L}_j] = \sum_k c_{ji}^k L_k - \sum_k \bar{c}_{ij}^k \bar{L}_k. \tag{2.3}$$

where $[L_i, \bar{L}_j] = L_i\bar{L}_j - \bar{L}_jL_i$ denotes the commutator.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $b\Omega$ denote the boundary of Ω. Throughout this thesis we restrict ourselves to a domain Ω such that $b\Omega$ is smooth in the following sense. We assume that in a neighborhood U of $b\Omega$ there exist a C^∞ real-valued function r such that $dr \neq 0$ in U and $r(z) = 0$ if and only if $z \in b\Omega$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $r > 0$ outside of $\bar{\Omega}$ and

$r < 0$ in Ω.

For $z_0 \in b\Omega$, we fix r so that $|\partial r| = 1$ in a neighborhood U of z_0. We choose $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_n$ to be (1,0)-forms on U such that $\omega_n = \partial r$ and such that $\langle \omega_i, \omega_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ for $z \in U$. We then define $L_1, \cdots, L_n, \bar{L}_1, \cdots, \bar{L}_n, \bar{\omega}_1, \cdots, \bar{\omega}_n$ as above. Note that on $U \cap b\Omega$, we have

$$L_j(r) = \bar{L}_j(r) = \delta_{jn}.$$

Thus, $L_1, \cdots, L_{n-1}$ and $\bar{L}_1, \cdots, \bar{L}_{n-1}$ are local bases of $T^{1,0}b\Omega := \mathbb{C}Tb\Omega \cap T^{1,0}\mathbb{C}^n$ and $T^{0,1}b\Omega := \mathbb{C}Tb\Omega \cap T^{0,1}\mathbb{C}^n$ respectively, where $\mathbb{C}Tb\Omega$ is the space of complex-valued tangent vectors to $b\Omega$. We define a vector field T on $U \cap b\Omega$ with values in $\mathbb{C}Tb\Omega$ by

$$T = L_n - \bar{L}_n.$$

Observe that $L_1, \cdots, L_{n-1}, \bar{L}_1, \cdots, \bar{L}_{n-1}, T$ are local basis of $\mathbb{C}Tb\Omega$ over $U \cap b\Omega$. Using integration by parts, we get the proof of following lemma

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\varphi, \psi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$, then we have*

$$(\bar{L}_j\varphi, \psi) = -(\varphi, L_j\psi) + \int_{b\Omega} \bar{L}_j(r)\varphi\bar{\psi}dS + (\varphi, a_j\psi)$$

where $a_j \in C^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$ and dS denotes the element of area on $b\Omega$.

Let (r_{ij}) be the Levi matrix of r. Substituting r for ϕ in (2.2), we get $r_{ij} = \bar{c}^n_{ij} = c^n_{ji}$ and by (2.3) we conclude

$$[L_i, \bar{L}_j] = r_{ij}T + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c^k_{ji}L_k - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \bar{c}^k_{ij}\bar{L}_k. \tag{2.4}$$

Remember that we have denoted by $\mathcal{A}^{0,k}$ the space of $(0,k)$-forms in $C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and by $C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k$ those which have compact support in U. If $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k$, then u can be written as

$$u = \sum_{|J|=k}{}' u_J\bar{\omega}_J, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\sum'$ denotes summation over strictly increasing indices $J = j_1 < ... < j_k$ and where $\bar{\omega}_J$ denotes the wedge product $\bar{\omega}_J = \bar{\omega}_{j_1} \wedge ... \wedge \bar{\omega}_{j_k}$. When the multiindices are not ordered, the coefficients are assumed to be alternant. Thus, if J decomposes as $J = jK$, then $u_{jK} = \epsilon^{jK}_J u_J$ where ϵ^{jK}_J is the sign if the permutation $jK \overset{\sim}{\to} J$.

There is a well defined Cauchy-Riemann complex

$$\mathcal{A}^{0,k-1} \overset{\bar{\partial}}{\to} \mathcal{A}^{0,k} \overset{\bar{\partial}}{\to} \mathcal{A}^{0,k+1}.$$

The action of $\bar{\partial}$ on a $(0,k)$ form is

$$\bar{\partial} u = \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{n} \bar{L}_j u_J \bar{\omega}_j \wedge \bar{\omega}_J + ... \tag{2.6}$$

where the dots refer to terms of order zero in u.

We extend this complex to $L_2^{0,k}(\Omega)$ the space of $(0,k)$-forms with L_2-coefficients, so that the Hilbert space techniques may be applied. For each $z \in \bar{\Omega}$, denote by $(dV)_z$ the unique positive (n,n)-form such that $|(dV)_z| = 1$. We call dV the volume element. For $u, v \in L_2^{0,k}(\Omega)$, we define the inner product and the norm by

$$(u,v) = \int_{\Omega} \langle u,v \rangle_z (dV)_z \quad \text{and} \quad \|u\|^2 = (u,u).$$

For each form of degree $(0,k)$, we define

$$\mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}) = \{v \in L_2^{0,k}(\Omega) : \bar{\partial} v \text{ (as distribution) } \in L_2^{0,k+1}(\Omega)\}.$$

Then the operator $\bar{\partial} : \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}) \to L_2^{0,k+1}(\Omega)$ is well-defined and, by noticing that $\mathcal{A}^{0,k} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial})$, we have $\bar{\partial} : L_2^{0,k}(\Omega) \to L_2^{0,k+1}(\Omega)$ as a densely defined operator. Thus, the operator $\bar{\partial}$ has an L_2-adjoint $\bar{\partial}^*$, defined as follows. If $u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$, there must exist $\alpha \in L_2^{0,k-1}$ such that

$$(v, \alpha) = (\bar{\partial} v, u) \text{ for all } v \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}).$$

In fact, this α is nothing but the form $\bar{\partial}^* u$ that we are assuming to exist. But we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\bar{\partial} v, u) &= \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{j=1} (\bar{L}_j v_K, u_{jK}) + (v, \dots) \\
&= \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{j=1} \Big(-(v_K, L_j u_{jK}) + \delta_{jn} \int_{b\Omega} v_K \bar{u}_{jK} dS \Big) + (v, \dots) \\
&= \sum_{j=1} \left(v, -\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' L_j u_{jK} \bar{\omega}_K) + \delta_{jn} \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \int_{b\Omega} v_K \bar{u}_{jK} dS \right) + (v, \dots)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where dots denote an error term in which u is not differentiated. Here the second equality in (2.7) follows from Lemma 2.1. If we pretend that this coincides with the action of $\alpha \in L_2^{0,k-1}$, then the boundary integral must vanish. We have thus obtained the proof of the following

Lemma 2.2.

$$u \in Dom(\bar\partial^*) \text{ if and only if } u_{jK}|_{b\Omega} = 0 \quad \text{for any} \quad K. \tag{2.8}$$

Over a form satisfying (2.8), the action of the Hilbert adjoint of $\bar\partial$, coindides with of its “formal adjoint” and is therefore expressed by a “divergence operator”

$$\bar\partial^* u = -\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_j L_j u_{jK} \bar\omega_K + ... \tag{2.9}$$

2.2 The basic estimate

For a real function ϕ in class C^2, let the weighted L_2^ϕ-norm be defined by

$$\|u\|_\phi^2 = (u,u)_\phi := \|ue^{-\frac{\phi}{2}}\|^2 = \int_\Omega \langle u,u\rangle e^{-\phi} dV.$$

Let $\bar\partial_\phi^*$ be the L_2^ϕ-adjoint of $\bar\partial$. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*) = \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial_\phi^*)$ and

$$\bar\partial_\phi^* u = -\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_j^\phi u_K \bar\omega_K + \cdots \tag{2.10}$$

where $\delta_j^\phi \varphi = e^\phi L_j(e^{-\phi}\varphi)$ and where dots denote an error term in which u is not differentiated and ϕ does not occur.

By developing the equalities (2.6) and (2.10), the key technical result is contained in the following

Proposition 2.3. *Let $z_0 \in b\Omega$ and fix an index q_o with $0 \le q_o \le n-1$, then there exists a neighborhood U of z_0 and a suitable constant C such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\bar\partial u\|_\phi^2 + \|\bar\partial_\phi^* u\|_\phi^2 + \|u\|_\phi^2 \\ &\gtrsim \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\phi_{ij} u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi - \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} (\phi_{jj} u_J, u_J)_\phi \\ &\quad + \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \int_{b\Omega} e^{-\phi} r_{ij} u_{iK} \bar u_{jK} dS - \sum_{|J|=q}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} \int_{b\Omega} e^{-\phi} r_{jj} |u_J|^2 dS \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_o} \|\delta_j^\phi u\|_\phi^2 + \sum_{j=q_o+1}^n \|\bar L_j u\|_\phi^2\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar\Omega)^k \cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$.

Proof. Let Au denote the sum in (2.6); we have

$$\|Au\|^2_\phi = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\bar{L}_j u_J\|^2_\phi - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1} \sum_{ij} (\bar{L}_i u_{jK}, \bar{L}_j u_{iK})_\phi. \tag{2.12}$$

Let Bu denote the sum in (2.10); we have

$$\|Bu\|^2_\phi = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1} \sum_{ij} (\delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, \delta^\phi_j u_{jK})_\phi. \tag{2.13}$$

Remember that Au and Bu differ from $\bar\partial u$ and $\bar\partial^*_\phi u$ by terms of order 0 which do not depend on ϕ. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\bar\partial u\|^2_\phi + \|\bar\partial^*_\phi u\|^2_\phi \\
&\qquad = \|Au\|^2_\phi + \|Bu\|^2_\phi + R \\
&\qquad = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k} \sum_{j=1}^n \|\bar{L}_j u_J\|^2_\phi + \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1} \sum_{i,j=1}^n (\delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, \delta^\phi_j u_{jK})_\phi - (\bar{L}_j u_{iK}, \bar{L}_i u_{jK})_\phi + R,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where R is an error coming from the scalar product of 0-order terms with terms $\bar{L}_j u_J$, $L_j u_{jK}$ or u.

We want to apply now integration by parts to the term $(\delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, \delta^\phi_j u_{jK})_\phi$ and $(\bar{L}_j u_{iK}, \bar{L}_i u_{jK})_\phi$. Notice that for each $\varphi, \psi \in C^1_c(U \cap \bar\Omega)$, similarly as in Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{cases}
(\varphi, \delta^\phi_j \psi)_\phi & = -(\bar{L}_j \varphi, \psi)_\phi + (a_j \varphi, \psi)_\phi + \delta_{jn} \int_{b\Omega} e^{-\phi} \varphi \bar\psi dS \\
-(\varphi, \bar{L}_i \psi)_\phi & = (\delta^\phi_i \varphi, \psi)_\phi - (b_i \varphi, \psi)_\phi - \delta_{in} \int_{b\Omega} e^{-\phi} \varphi \bar\psi dS
\end{cases}$$

and for some $a_j, b_i \in C^1(\bar\Omega \cap U)$ independent of ϕ.

This immediately implies

$$\begin{cases}
(\delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, \delta^\phi_j u_{jK})_\phi & = -(\bar{L}_j \delta^\phi_i u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi + \delta_{jn} \int_{b\Omega} e^{-\phi} \delta^\phi_i (u_{iK}) \bar{u}_{jK} dS + R \\
-(\bar{L}_j u_{iK}, \bar{L}_i u_{jK})_\phi & = (\delta^\phi_i \bar{L}_j u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi - \delta_{in} \int_{b\Omega} e^{-\phi} L_j (u_{iK}) \bar{u}_{jK} dS + R.
\end{cases} \tag{2.15}$$

From here on, we denote by R terms involving the product of u by $\delta^\phi_j u$ for $j \le n-1$ or $\bar{L}_j u$ for $j \le n$ but not twice a derivative of u.

Recall that $u_{nK}|_{b\Omega} \equiv 0$ and $L_j(u_{nK})|_{b\Omega} \equiv 0$ if $j \le n-1$. We thus conclude that the boundary integrals vanish in both equalities of (2.15). Now, by taking the sum of two terms in the right side of (2.15), after discarding the boundary integrals, we put in evidence the commutator $[\delta_i^\phi, \bar{L}_j]$

$$(\delta_i^\phi u_{iK}, \delta_j^\phi u_{jK})_\phi - (\bar{L}_j u_{iK}, \bar{L}_i u_{jK})_\phi = ([\delta_i^\phi, \bar{L}_j] u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi + R. \tag{2.16}$$

Notice that (2.15) is also true if we replace both u_{iK} and u_{jK} by u_J for indices $i = j \leq q_0$. Then we obtain

$$\|\bar{L}_j u_J\|_\phi^2 = \|\delta_j^\phi u_J\|_\phi^2 - ([\delta_j^\phi, \bar{L}_j] u_J, u_J)_\phi + R. \tag{2.17}$$

Applying (2.16) and (2.17) to the last line in (2.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\bar{\partial} u\|_\phi^2 + \|\bar{\partial}_\phi^* u\|_\phi^2 \\
&\quad = \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} ([\delta_i^\phi, \bar{L}_j] u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi - \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_0} ([\delta_j^\phi, \bar{L}_j] u_J, u_J)_\phi \\
&\quad + \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0} \|\delta_j^\phi u_J\|_\phi^2 + \sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n} \|\bar{L}_j u_J\|_\phi^2 \Big) + R.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Now we calculate the commutator $[\delta_i^\phi, \bar{L}_j]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
[\delta_i^\phi, \bar{L}_j] &= L_i \bar{L}_j \phi + [L_i, \bar{L}_j] \\
&= \phi_{ij} + \sum_{k}^{n} c_{ji}^k \delta_k^\phi - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \bar{c}_{ij}^k \bar{L}_k \\
&= \phi_{ij} + r_{ij}(\delta_n^\phi - \bar{L}_n) + \sum_{k}^{n-1} c_{ji}^k \delta_k^\phi - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \bar{c}_{ij}^k \bar{L}_k
\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

where we have used (2.2) and (2.4).

Since $\langle L_n, \partial r \rangle = 1$, we have

$$(r_{ij} \delta_n^\phi u_{iK}, u_{jK})_\phi = \int_{b\Omega} r_{ij} e^{-\phi} u_{iK} u_{jK} dS + R. \tag{2.20}$$

Substituting (2.19) in (2.18) and combining with (2.20), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\bar\partial u\|^2_\phi+\|\bar\partial^*_\phi u\|^2_\phi\\
&\quad=\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{i,j=1}^{n}(\phi_{ij}u_{iK},u_{jK})_\phi-\sum_{|J|=k}{}'\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}(\phi_{jj}u_J,u_J)_\phi\\
&\quad+\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1}\int_{b\Omega}r_{ij}u_{iK}\bar u_{jK}e^{-\phi}dS-\sum_{|J|=k}{}'\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\int_{b\Omega}r_{jj}|u_J|e^{-\phi}dS\\
&\quad+\sum_{|J|=k}{}'\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|\delta^\phi_j u_J\|^2_\phi+\sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n}\|\bar L_j u_J\|^2_\phi\Big)+R.
\end{aligned}\tag{2.21}$$

We denote by S the sum in the last line in (2.21). To conclude our proof, we only need to prove that for a suitable C independent of ϕ we have

$$R\le\frac12\sum_{|J|=k}{}'\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|\delta^\phi_j u_J\|^2_\phi+\sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n}\|\bar L_j u_J\|^2_\phi\Big)+C\|u\|^2_\phi.\tag{2.22}$$

In fact, if we point our attention at those terms which involve $\delta^\phi_j u$ for $j\le q_o$ or $\bar L_j u$ for $q_o+1\le j\le n$, then (2.22) is clear since S carries the corresponding square $\|\delta^\phi_j u\|^2_\phi$ and $\|\bar L_j u\|^2_\phi$. Otherwise, we note that for $j\le n-1$ we may interchange $\bar L_j$ and δ^ϕ_j by means of integration by parts: boundary integrals do not occur because $L_j(r)=0$ on $b\Omega$ for $j\le n-1$. As for δ^ϕ_n, notice that it only hits coefficients whose index contains n and hence $u_{nK}=0$ on $b\Omega$. So $\delta^\phi_n(u_{nK})\bar u$ is also interchangeable with $u_{nK}\bar L_n\bar u$ by integration by parts. This concludes the proof of Proposition 2.3. □

For the choice $\phi=0$, we can rewrite the estimate (2.11) as

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(u,u)\gtrsim&\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1}\int_{b\Omega}u_{iK}\bar u_{jK}dS-\sum_{|J|=q}{}'\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\int_{b\Omega}|u_J|^2dS\\
&+\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\|L_ju\|^2+\sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n}\|\bar L_ju\|^2
\end{aligned}\tag{2.23}$$

for any $u\in C^\infty_c(U\cap\bar\Omega)^k\cap\mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$.

Observe that if $\varphi\in C^\infty_c(U\cap\bar\Omega)$ with $\varphi|_{b\Omega}\equiv0$ on $U\cap b\Omega$, then each $\|L_j\varphi\|^2$ can be interchanged with $\|\bar L_j\varphi\|^2+R$ even for $j=n$ due to the vanishing of the boundary integral. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\|L_j\varphi\|^2+&\sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n}\|\bar{L}_j\varphi\|^2+C\|\varphi\|^2\\&\geq\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(\|L_j\varphi\|^2+\|\bar{L}_j\varphi\|^2\right)+\|\varphi\|^2\\&\gtrsim\|\varphi\|_1^2,\end{aligned}\tag{2.24}$$

where $\|.\|_1$ is the Sobolev norm of index 1.

In conclusion, we get an estimate which fully expresses the interior elliptic regularity of the system $(\bar{\partial},\bar{\partial}^*)$

$$Q(u,u)\gtrsim\|u\|_1^2\tag{2.25}$$

for any $u\in C_c^\infty(U\cap\bar{\Omega})^k$ with $u|_{U\cap b\Omega}=0$. We keep our choice of $\phi=0$. Using observation (2.24) for φ replaced by u_{nK} for any K, we get

$$\begin{aligned}Q(u,u)\gtrsim&\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1}\int_{b\Omega}r_{ij}u_{iK}\bar{u}_{jK}dS-\sum_{|J|=q}{}'\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\int_{b\Omega}r_{jj}|u_J|^2dS\\&+\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\|L_ju\|^2+\sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n}\|\bar{L}_ju\|^2+\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\|u_{nK}\|_1^2\end{aligned}\tag{2.26}$$

for any $u\in C_c^\infty(U\cap\bar{\Omega})^k\cap\mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$.

Conversely, and still under the choice $\phi=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}Q(u,u)\lesssim&\Big|\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1}\int_{b\Omega}r_{ij}u_{iK}\bar{u}_{jK}dS-\sum_{|J|=q}{}'\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\int_{b\Omega}r_{jj}|u_J|^2dS\Big|\\&+\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\|L_ju\|^2+\sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n}\|\bar{L}_ju\|^2+\|u\|^2\end{aligned}\tag{2.27}$$

for any $u\in C_c^\infty(U\cap\bar{\Omega})^k\cap\mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$. This inequality is a consequence of the calculation in Proposition 2.3 and holds without the assumption of pseudoconvexity.

2.3 q-pseudoconvex/concave domains

Let $\lambda_1(z) \leq ... \leq \lambda_{n-1}(z)$ be the eigenvalues of $(r_{jk}(z))_{j,k=1}^{n-1}$ and denote by $s^+_{b\Omega}(z)$, $s^-_{b\Omega}(z)$, $s^0_{b\Omega}(z)$ their number according to the different sign.

We take a pair of indices $1 \leq q \leq n-1$ and $0 \leq q_o \leq n-1$ such that $q \neq q_o$. We assume that there is a bundle $\mathcal{V}^{q_o} \in T^{1,0}b\Omega$ of rank q_o with smooth coefficients that, by reordering, we may suppose to be the bundle $\mathcal{V}^{q_o} =$ span $\{L_1, ..., L_{q_o}\}$, such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} \lambda_j(z) - \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} r_{jj}(z) \geq 0 \qquad z \in U \cap b\Omega. \tag{2.28}$$

We define Ω to be q-pseudoconvex or q-pseudoconcave according to $q > q_o$ or $q < q_o$.

Lemma 2.4. *Condition* (2.28) *is equivalent to*

$$\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij=1}^{n-1} r_{ij} u_{iK} \bar{u}_{jK} - \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} r_{jj} |u|^2 \geq 0 \text{ on } U \cap b\Omega \tag{2.29}$$

for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^q \cap Dom(\bar{\partial}^*)$.

Proof. The proof of the Lemma immediately follows from the estimate

$$\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij=1}^{n-1} r_{ij} u_{iK} \bar{u}_{jK} \geq \sum_{j=1}^{q} \lambda_j |u|^2,$$

for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^q \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$ with equality for a suitable u. In turn, the proof of this estimate is obtained by diagonalizing the matrix (r_{ij}) (cf. [H65] and [C87]).

□

As it has already been noticed, (2.28) for $q > q_o$ implies $\lambda_q \geq 0$; hence (2.28) is still true if we replace the first sum $\sum_{j=1}^{q} \cdot$ by $\sum_{j=1}^{k} \cdot$ for any k such that $q \leq k \leq n-1$. Similarly, if it holds for $q < q_o$, then $\lambda_{q+1} \leq 0$ and hence it also holds with q replaced by $k \leq q$ in the first sum.

We notice that q-pseudoconvexity/concavity is invariant under a change of an orthonormal basis but not of an adapted frame. In fact, not only the number, but also the size of the eigenvalues comes into play. Thus, when we say that $b\Omega$ is q-pseudoconvex/concave, we mean that there is an adapted frame in which

(2.28) is fulfilled. Sometimes, it is more convenient to put our calculatiuons in an orthonormal frame. In this case, it is meant that the metric has been changed so that the adapted frame has become orthonormal.

Example 2.1. Let $s^-(z)$ be constant for $z \in b\Omega$ close to z_0; then (2.28) holds for $q_o = s^-$ and $q = s^- + 1$. In fact, we have $\lambda_{s^-} < 0 \leq \lambda_{s^-+1}$, and therefore the negative eigenvectors span a bunlde $\mathcal{V}^{q_o}$ for $q_o = s^-$ that, identified with the span of the first q_o coordinate vector fields, yields $\sum_{j=1}^{q_o+1} \lambda_j(z) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} r_{jj}(z)$. Note that a pseudoconvex domain is characterized by $s^-(z) \equiv 0$, thus, it is 1-pseudoconvex in our terminology. In the same way, if $s^+(z)$ is constant for $z \in b\Omega$ close to z_0, then $\lambda_{s^-+s^0} \leq 0 < \lambda_{s^-+s^0+1}$. Then, the eigenspace of the eigenvectors ≤ 0 is a bundle which, identified to that of the first $q_o = s^- + s^0$ coordinate vector fields yields (2.28) for $q = q_o - 1$. In particular a pseudoconcave domain, that is, a domain which satisfies $s^+ \equiv 0$, is $(n-2)$-pseudoconcave in our terminology.

Example 2.2. Let Ω satisfy $Z(q)$ condition at z_0, that is, $s^+(z) \geq n - q$ or $s^-(z) \geq q + 1$ for $z \in U \cap b\Omega$. Thus Ω is strongly q-pseudoconvex or strongly q-pseudoconcave at z_0

Example 2.3. Let Ω be a domain in a neighborhood z_0 with a defining function

$$r = 2\text{Re}z_n - a(z_1, ..., z_{q_o}) + b(z_{q_o+1}, ..., z_{n-1})$$

where a and b are real functions which vanish at 0 and such that $(a_{z_i\bar{z}_j})_{ij=1}^{q_o}$ and $(b_{z_i\bar{z}_j})_{ij=q_o+1}^{n-1}$ are semipositive matrices. We can check that Ω is (q_o+1)-pseudoconvex and (q_o-1)-pseudoconcave at z_0 (cf. Proposition 7.3 which follows).

Remark 2.5. By the identity $\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \lambda_j(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} r_{jj}(z)$, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q} \lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} r_{jj} = \sum_{j=q+1}^{n-1} (-\lambda_j) - \sum_{j=n-1}^{q_o+1} (-r_{jj}).$$

Therefore, if Ω defined by $r < 0$ is q-pseudoconvex (q-pseudoconcave) at z_0, then $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega} = \{-r < 0\}$ is $(n-q-1)$-pseudoconcave ($(n-q-1)$-pseudoconvex) at z_0.

2.4 Tangential pseudodifferential operators

In our study of the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$-estimates, we use tangential pseudo-differential operators in a neighborhood of $z_0 \in b\Omega$. These are expressed in terms of boundary coordinates which are defined as follows.

Definition 2.6. A system of real C^∞ coordinates, defined in a neighborhood U of $z_0 \in b\Omega$ is said a system of *boundary coordinates* if one of the coordinates is the defining function r. We denote such a system by $(x, r) = (x_1, ..., x_{2n-1}, r) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ and call the x_j's the *tangential* coordinates and r the *normal coordinate.*

We denote the dual variables of x by ξ, and define $x \cdot \xi = \sum x_i \xi_j$; $|\xi|^2 = \sum \xi_j^2$. For $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$ we define $\tilde{\varphi}$, the *tangential Fourier transform* of φ, by

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} e^{-ix\cdot\xi} \varphi(t, r) dt.$$

Denote by $\Lambda_\xi = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ the standard "tangential" elliptic symbol of order 1 and by Λ the operator with symbol Λ_ξ. For $f \in C^\infty([1, +\infty))$ we define $f(\Lambda)\varphi$ by

$$f(\Lambda)\varphi(\xi, r) = (2\pi)^{-(2n-1)} \int e^{ix\cdot\xi} f(\Lambda_\xi) \tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r) d\xi. \tag{2.30}$$

Hence

$$\|f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 = \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} f(\Lambda_\xi)^2 |\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r)|^2 d\xi dr. \tag{2.31}$$

In the case $f(t) = t^s$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, we define tangential Sobolev norms by

$$|||\varphi|||_s = \|\Lambda^s \varphi\| \tag{2.32}$$

Lemma 2.7. *Let $f, g \in C^\infty([1, +\infty))$ satisfy $f \gg g$. Then, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$ there exists a constant $C_{\epsilon,s}$ such that*

$$\|g(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 \leq \epsilon \|f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 + C_{\epsilon,s} |||\varphi|||_{-s}^2$$

for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$.

Proof. Since $f \gg g$, that is, $\lim\limits_{t\to+\infty} \frac{f(t)}{g(t)} = +\infty$, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $t_\epsilon > 0$ such that $g(\Lambda_\xi) \leq \epsilon f(\Lambda_\xi)$ for $|\xi| \geq t_\epsilon$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|g(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 =& \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{|\xi|\geq t_\epsilon} g(\Lambda_\xi)^2 |\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r)|^2 dr d\xi + \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{|\xi|\leq t_\epsilon} g(\Lambda_\xi)^2 |\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r)|^2 dr d\xi \\
\leq& \epsilon \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{|\xi|\geq t_\epsilon} f(\Lambda_\xi)^2 |\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r)|^2 dr d\xi + \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{|\xi|\leq t_\epsilon} g(\Lambda_\xi)^2 |\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r)|^2 dr d\xi \\
\leq& \epsilon \|f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 + C_{\epsilon,s} |||u|||_{-s}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

□

In $\mathbb{R}^{2n}_- = \{(x_1, ..., x_{2n})|x_{2n} = r \le 0\}$, the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}$ is the space of smooth functions which decrease rapidly at infinity

$$\mathcal{S} = \{f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n}_-)| \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^{2n}_-} |x^\alpha D^\beta f(x)| < \infty \text{ for any } \alpha, \beta\},$$

where α and β are $2n$-indices and $D^\beta = \frac{\partial^{\beta_1}}{\partial x^{\beta_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{\beta_{2n}}}{\partial x^{\beta_{2n}}}$. Recall the class of functions $\mathcal{F}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f \in C^\infty([1, +\infty)\Big| f(t) \lesssim t^{\frac{1}{2}}; f'(t) \ge 0 \text{ and } |f^{(m)}(t)| \lesssim |\frac{f^{(m-1)}(t)}{t}|\}$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $f \in \mathcal{F}$; $a \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2n}_-)$; $s \in \mathbb{R}$; and S be the a vector field with coefficients in $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2n}_-)$. Then, we have*

(i) $|||[f(\Lambda), a]\varphi|||_s \lesssim |||f(\Lambda)\varphi|||_{s-1}$;

(ii) $|||[f(\Lambda), S]\varphi|||_s \lesssim |||f(\Lambda)\varphi|||_s + |||D_r f(\Lambda)\varphi|||_{s-1}$;

for any $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$.

Proof. Let $\sigma(A)$ denote the symbol of operator A. We have

$$\sigma([A, B]) = \sum_{k>0} \frac{(\partial/\partial\xi)^k \sigma(A) D^k_x \sigma(B) - (\partial/\partial\xi)^k \sigma(B) D^k_x \sigma(A)}{k!}. \tag{2.33}$$

(Notice here that the $k = 0$ term cancels out.) Using formula (2.33) for $A = f(\Lambda)$ where $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $B = a \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^{2n}_-)$, we obtain

$$|\sigma([f(\Lambda), a])| \lesssim \sigma(\Lambda^{-1} f(\Lambda)).$$

The second part of this proposition immediately follows from the first part if we notice that $S = \sum_k a_k(x, r)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} + b(x, r)\frac{\partial}{\partial r}$.

□

Proposition 2.9. *For $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we have the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Lambda^{-1} f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2_1 \lesssim &\sum_{j=1}^{q_0} \|L_j \Lambda^{-1} f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 + \sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n} \|\bar{L}_j \Lambda^{-1} f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 \\ &+ \|\Lambda^{-1} f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 + \|\Lambda^{-1/2} f(\Lambda)\varphi_b\|^2_b \end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

for any $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$.

The above proposition is a variant of Theorem (2.4.5) of [FK72]. The key in proving this theorem is a passage from functions in $C^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$ to $C^\infty(U \cap b\Omega)$. This is done by using an extension of ψ from $U \cap b\Omega$ to $U \cap \bar{\Omega}$. For $\psi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap b\Omega)$, we define $\psi^{(e)} \in C^\infty(\{(x,r) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \big| r \leq 0\})$ by

$$\psi^{(e)}(x,r) = (2\pi)^{-(2n-1)} \int e^{ix\cdot\xi} e^{r(1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}} \tilde{\psi}(\xi, r) d\xi$$

so that $\psi^{(e)}(x,0) = \psi(x)$.

Lemma 2.10. *For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $k \geq 0$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we have*

(i) $|||r^k f(\Lambda)\psi^{(e)}|||_s \cong C_k \|f(\Lambda)\psi\|_{b,s-k-\frac{1}{2}}$

(ii) $|||D_r f(\Lambda)\psi^{(e)}|||_s \cong \|f(\Lambda)\psi\|_{b,s+\frac{1}{2}}$

for any $\psi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap b\Omega)$.

Proof. (i). We observe that for every positive integer k, we have by integration by parts

$$\int_{-\infty}^{0} r^{2k} e^{r(1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}} dr = C'_k (1+|\xi|^2)^{-k-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{2.35}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |||r^k f(\Lambda)\psi^{(e)}|||_s^2 \cong & \int_{-\infty}^{0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} r^{2k} e^{2r(1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}} (1+|\xi|^2)^s f((1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2})^2 |\psi(\xi)|^2 d\xi dr \\ \cong & C'_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} (1+|\xi|^2)^{s-k-\frac{1}{2}} f((1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2})^2 |\psi(\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ \cong & C'_k |||f(\Lambda)\psi|||_{b,s-k-\frac{1}{2}}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.36}$$

(ii). Since the derivative D_r does not affect the variables in which we take the Fourier transform, the two operations commute. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |||D_r f(\Lambda)\psi^{(e)}|||_s^2 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} \int_{-\infty}^{0} (1+|\xi|^2)^s f((1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2})^2 \\ &\qquad \times (1+|\xi|^2) e^{2r(1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2}} |\tilde{\psi}(\xi,0)|^2 dr d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} f((1+|\xi|^2)^{1/2})^2 (1+|\xi|^2)^{s+1/2} |\tilde{\psi}(\xi,0)|^2 d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \|f(\Lambda)\psi\|_{b,s+\frac{1}{2}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The lemma is proved.

$\square$

Proof of Proposition 2.9. Instead for the system $\{L_j\}_{j\le q_o}\cup\{\bar{L}_j\}_{q_o+1\le j\le n}$, we prove the theorem for a general elliptic system $\{S_j\}_{1\le j\le n}$ where the S_j's are vector fields in $\mathbb{C}T\mathbb{C}^n$. This means that there exist no $\eta\in T^*\mathbb{C}^n\setminus\{0\}$ such that $\langle S_j,\eta\rangle_x=0$ for all $j=1,...,n$.

Assume for a moment that $\varphi(x,0)=0$, (i.e, $\varphi|_{b\Omega}=0$), which implies that $\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi(x,0)=0$ since the boundary condition is invariant under the action of tangential operators. Now, (2.24) holds for a general elliptic system; this yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|_1^2 &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^n\left(\|S_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2+\|\bar{S}_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2\right)+\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2\\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^n\|S_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2+\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{2.37}$$

Next, consider a general φ. Let φ_b be the restriction of φ to boundary, that is, $\varphi_b(x)=\varphi(x,0)$. We set $\varphi^{(0)}=\varphi-\varphi^{(e)}$. Then, $\varphi^{(0)}$ vanishes on the boundary so that the previous result applies to $\varphi^{(0)}$. We then have

$$\|f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(0)}\|^2\lesssim\sum_{j=1}^n\|S_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(0)}\|^2+\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(0)}\|^2.\tag{2.38}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|_1^2 \lesssim&\|f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(0)}\|^2+\|f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2\\ \lesssim&\sum_{j=1}^n\|S_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(0)}\|^2+\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(0)}\|^2+\|f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2\\ \lesssim&\sum_{j=1}^n\left(\|S_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2+\|S_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2\right)\\ &+\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2+\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2+\|f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2\\ \lesssim&\sum_{j=1}^n\|S_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2+\|D_r\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2\\ &+\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2+\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2+\|f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2,\end{aligned}\tag{2.39}$$

since the S_j's are linear combinations of the tangential derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$'s and of D_r . Using Lemma 2.10, $\|D_r\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2$ and $\|f(\Lambda)\varphi^{(e)}\|^2$ are also estimated in the same way. This concludes the proof.

□

Chapter 3

$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$-estimate : a sufficient condition

In this chapter, we give the proof of Theorem 1.10.

3.1 Reduction to the boundary

Since the Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ only concerns u^τ, the tangential component of u, we first prove the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})$-estimate for u^τ, that is,

$$\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 \lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau)+C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u^\tau|||^2_{-1}. \tag{3.1}$$

As a first step, we reduce the estimate (3.1) to the boundary by the following

Theorem 3.1. *Let Ω be q-pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconcave) at a boundary point z_0. Then, there is a neighborhood U of z_0 such that*

$$\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 \lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau)+C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u^\tau|||^2_{-1}+||\Lambda^{-1/2}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau_b||^2_b, \tag{3.2}$$

for any $u\in C^\infty_c(U\cap\bar\Omega)^k\cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$ and $k\geq q$ (resp. $k\leq q$).

Before the proof of Theorem 3.1, we need following lemma

Lemma 3.2. *Let Ω be the q-pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconcave) at boundary point z_0. Then, there is a neighborhood U of z_0 such that*

$$\sum_{|J|=k}{}' \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\|L_ju_J\|^2+\sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n}\|\bar L_ju_J\|^2+\|D_r\Lambda^{-1}u_J\|^2+\|u_J\|^2\Big)\lesssim Q(u,u) \tag{3.3}$$

for any $u\in C^\infty_c(U\cap\bar\Omega)^k\cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$ with $k\geq q$ (resp. $k\leq q$).

Proof. We only need to show that

$$\sum_{|J|=k}{}' \|D_r\Lambda^{-1}u_J\|^2 \lesssim Q(u,u).$$

Since $D_r = a\bar{L}_n + bT$ where $a, b \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ and T is a tangential operator of order 1, then

$$\|D_r\Lambda^{-1}u_J\|^2 \lesssim \|\bar{L}_n u_J\|^2 + \|T\Lambda^{-1}u\|^2 \lesssim \|\bar{L}_n u_J\|^2 + \|u\|^2 \lesssim Q(u,u).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Applying Proposition 2.9 for $\varphi = \mathcal{M}u^\tau \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 \lesssim & \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} \|L_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 + \sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n} \|\bar{L}_j\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 \\ & + \|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 + \|\Lambda^{-1/2}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau_b\|_b^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Let $S \in \{L_j\}_{j\le q_0} \cup \{L_j\}_{q_0+1\le j\le n}$.

Case 1. If $\mathcal{M} = M\rho$, where $\rho \in \mathcal{A}^{0,0}$ and M is either every positive munber or 1, then

$$\mathcal{M}u^\tau := M|\rho||u^\tau|;$$

it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \|S\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 =& M^2 \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \|S\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\rho u^\tau_J\|^2 \\ \lesssim& M^2 \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \Big(\|\rho\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)Su^\tau_J\|^2 \\ & + \|\rho[S, \Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)]u^\tau_J\|^2 + \|[S\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda), \rho]u^\tau_J\|^2 \Big) \\ \lesssim& M^2 \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \Big(\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)Su^\tau_J\|^2 + \|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)u^\tau_J\|^2 + \|D_r\Lambda^{-2}f(\Lambda)u^\tau_J\|^2 \Big) \\ \lesssim& \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \Big(\|Su^\tau_J\|^2 + \|u^\tau_J\|^2 + \|D_r\Lambda^{-1}u^\tau_J\| + C_M|||u^\tau_J|||^2_{-1} \Big) \\ \lesssim& Q(u^\tau, u^\tau) + C_M|||u^\tau_J|||^2_{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where the second inequality follows from Proposition 2.8, the fourth from Lemma 2.7 and the last from Lemma 3.2.

Case 2. Let $\mathcal{M} = M\theta$, where $\theta \in \mathcal{A}^{0,1}$ and M is either every positive number or 1. Remember that

$$\mathcal{M}u^\tau := M\sqrt{\Big|\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \Big|\sum_{j=1}^{n}\theta_j u^\tau_{jK}\Big|^2 - \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_o}|\theta_j|^2|u^\tau_J|^2\Big|} \tag{3.6}$$

In the same way as in case 1, we get

$$\|S\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 \lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau) + C_M|||u^\tau_J|||^2_{-1}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

□

Remark 3.3. We notice again that we put $C_{\mathcal{M}} := C_M$ if M is every positive number and $C_{\mathcal{M}} := 0$ if $M = 1$.

3.2 Estimate on the strip

In this section, we show the Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ implies a related estimate on the δ-strip near the boundary for each $\delta > 0$.

Recall that $S_\delta := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : -\delta < r < 0\}$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let Ω be q-pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconcave) at the boundary point z_0. Assume that property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ holds at z_0 with $k \geq q$ (resp. $k \leq q$). Then, there is a neighborhood U of z_0 such that for any $\delta > 0$*

$$f(\delta^{-1})^2\int_{S_{\delta/2}}|\mathcal{M}u^\tau|^2 dV \lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau) \tag{3.7}$$

holds for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U\cap\bar\Omega)^k \cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$.

To simplify, define the quadratic form $H^\Phi_{q_o}(u)$ by

$$H^\Phi_{q_o}(u) = \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij=1}^{n}\phi_{ij}u_{iK}\bar u_{jK} - \sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\phi_{jj}|u|^2$$

Proof of Theorem 3.4. The proof is divided into two steps. In step 1, we modify $\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}$ to $\tilde\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}$ which has the property that we need not only on the strip but also on the whole Ω. In step 2, we prove the estimate (3.7).

Step 1. By our assumption, for any $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, there is a function $\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} H_{q_o}^{\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}(u^\tau) \geq c\Big(f(\delta^{-1})^2|\mathcal{M}u^\tau|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{q_o}|\Phi_j^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}u^\tau|^2\Big) \\ |\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}| \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{on } U \cap S_\delta \tag{3.8}$$

where $\Phi_j^{\delta,\mathcal{M}} = L_j(\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}})$.

Now, u^τ has support in U but the properties of $\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}$ only hold on the strip S_δ. Therefore, we have to modify $\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}$ to $\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}$ to get the properties on the whole U.

We define

$$\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}} := \Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}\chi(-\frac{r}{\delta}), \tag{3.9}$$

where χ is a cut off function which satisfies $\chi(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } t \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{for } t \geq 1, \end{cases}$ and $\dot{\chi} \leq 0$.

Computation of $\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}$ shows that

$$\partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}} = \chi\partial\bar{\partial}\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}} - \frac{\dot{\chi}\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}{\delta}\partial\bar{\partial}r - 2\text{ Re }\frac{\dot{\chi}}{\delta}\partial\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}} \otimes \bar{\partial}r + \frac{\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}\ddot{\chi}}{\delta^2}\partial r \otimes \bar{\partial}r. \tag{3.10}$$

Notice that, if i or j is $\leq n-1$, then

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{ij}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}} = \chi\Phi_{ij}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}} - \frac{\dot{\chi}\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}{\delta}r_{ij}.$$

We remark that $\langle\partial r, u^\tau\rangle \equiv 0$ and therefore

$$H_{q_o}^{\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}(u^\tau) = \chi H_{q_o}^{\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}(u^\tau) - \frac{\dot{\chi}\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}{\delta}H_{q_o}^r(u^\tau). \tag{3.11}$$

We note now that we can write $r = 2Rez_n + h(z_1, ..., z_{n-1}, y_n)$ for a graphing local defining function. Denote by $z \to z^*$ the projection $\mathbb{C}^n \to b\Omega$ in a neigborhood of z_0 along the x_n-axis. We have the evident equality $(r_{ij}(z))_{ij}^{n-1} = (r_{ij}(z^*))_{ij=1}^{n-1}$. Thus the second term in right hand side of (3.11) can be discarded since Ω is q-pseudoconvex. (Recall here that $\dot{\chi} \leq 0$.)

Combining with (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{q_o}^{\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}(u^\tau) &\geq \chi H_{q_o}^{\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}(u^\tau) \\ &\geq c\chi\Big(f(\delta^{-1})^2|\mathcal{M}u^\tau|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{q_o}|\Phi_j^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}u^\tau|^2\Big) \\ &\geq c\Big(\chi f(\delta^{-1})^2|\mathcal{M}u^\tau|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{q_o}|\tilde{\Phi}_j^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}u^\tau|^2\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

for $z \in U \cap \Omega$. Here last inequality follows from $(\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}})_j = \chi(\Phi^{\delta,\mathcal{M}})_j$ for $j \leq q_o$ and $\chi \geq \chi^2$.

Step 2. We apply Proposition 2.3 for $\phi = \psi(\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}})$ and $u = u^\tau$. First, we remark that

$$\begin{aligned} H_{q_o}^{\phi}(u^\tau) =&\dot{\psi} H_{q_o}^{\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}(u^\tau) \\ &+\ddot{\psi}\Big(\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}|\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\tilde{\Phi}_j^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}u^\tau_{jK}|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{q_0}|\tilde{\Phi}_j^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}|^2|u^\tau|^2\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\partial}^*_\phi u^\tau\|^2_\phi \leq& 2\|\bar{\partial}^* u^\tau\|^2_\phi + 2\|\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\phi_j u^\tau_{jK}\bar{\omega}_K\|^2_\phi \\ =&2\|\bar{\partial}^* u^\tau\|^2_\phi + 2\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\|\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\dot{\psi}\tilde{\Phi}_j^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}u^\tau_{jK}\|^2_\phi. \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Thus we get from (2.11) applied to u^τ, under the choice of the weight $\phi = \psi(\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}})$ and taking into account (3.13) and (3.14)

$$\begin{aligned} 2\|\bar{\partial}u^\tau\|^2_\phi +& 4\|\bar{\partial}^* u^\tau\|^2_\phi + C\|u^\tau\|^2_\phi \\ &\geq \int_\Omega \dot{\psi}e^{-\phi}H_{q_o}^{\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}(u^\tau)dV \\ &+ \int_\Omega(\ddot{\psi} - 4\dot{\psi}^2)e^{-\phi}\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}|\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\tilde{\Phi}_j^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}u^\tau_{jK}|^2 dV \\ &- \int_\Omega \ddot{\psi}e^{-\phi}\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}|\tilde{\Phi}_j^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}|^2|u^\tau|^2 dV. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

We now specify our choice of ψ. First, we want $\ddot{\psi} \geq 4\dot{\psi}^2$ so that the term in the third line of (3.15) can be disregarded. Keeping this condition, we need an opposite estimate which assures that the absolute value of the second negative term in the last line of (3.15) is controlled by one half of the term in the second line. In fact, from (3.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \dot{\psi} e^{-\phi} H^{\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}_{q_o}(u^\tau)dV - \int_\Omega \ddot{\psi} e^{-\phi}\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}|\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}_j|^2|u^\tau|^2dV \\ \geq \int_\Omega e^{-\phi}\Big(\frac{1}{2}c\dot{\psi}-\ddot{\psi}\Big)\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}|\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}_j|^2|u^\tau|^2dV.\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

The above term is nonnegative as soon as $\ddot{\psi} \leq \frac{c}{2}\dot{\psi}$. If we then set $\psi := \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{c}{2}(t-1)}$ then both requests are satisfied. Thus the inequality of (3.15) continues as

$$\begin{aligned}&\geq \frac{1}{2}\int_\Omega \dot{\psi} e^{-\phi} H^{\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}}_{q_o}(u^\tau)dV \\ &\geq \int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}\dot{\psi} e^{-\phi} c f(\delta^{-1})^2\chi(-\frac{r}{\delta})|\mathcal{M}u^\tau|^2dV \\ &\geq \frac{c}{2}f(\delta^{-1})^2\int_{S_{\delta/2}}\dot{\psi} e^{-\phi}|\mathcal{M}u^\tau|^2dV.\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Here the first inequality comes from (3.12) and the last equality follows from $\chi(\frac{-r}{\delta}) = 1$ on $S_{\delta/2}$.

Now, we want to remove the weight from the resulting inequality. The weight in the first line of (3.15) can be handled owing to $e^{-\phi} \leq 1$ on $\bar{\Omega}\cap U$. Furthermore, since $|\tilde{\Phi}^{\delta,\mathcal{M}}| < 1$ on U, then the term $\dot{\psi}e^{-\phi}$ in the last line of (3.17) is bounded from below by a positive constant. We end up with the unweighted estimate

$$\|\bar{\partial}u^\tau\|^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^*u^\tau\|^2 + \|u^\tau\|^2 \gtrsim f(\delta^{-1})^2\int_{S_{\delta/2}}|\mathcal{M}u^\tau|^2dV. \tag{3.18}$$

This concludes the proof of the theorem.

□

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.10

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.10. We first prove it for u replaced by u^τ.

Theorem 3.5. *Let Ω be q-pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconcave) at $z_0 \in b\Omega$ and assume that Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ holds at z_0. Then, we have*

$$\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 \lesssim Q(u^\tau, u^\tau) + C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u^\tau|||^2_{-1} \tag{3.19}$$

for any $u^\tau \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k \cap Dom(\bar{\partial}^*)$ with $k \geq q$ (resp. $k \leq q$).

For the proof of Theorem 3.5, we use the method by [C87].
Let $\{p_k\}$ with $k = 0, 1, \dots$ be a sequence of cutoff functions with the properties

1. $\sum_{k=0}^\infty p_k^2(t) \cong 1$; for any $t \geq 0$
2. $p_k(t) \equiv 0$ if $t \notin (2^{k-1}, 2^{k+1})$ with $k \geq 1$ and $p_0(t) \equiv 0$ if $t \geq 2$.

We can also choose p_k so that $p_k'(t) \lesssim 2^{-k}$.

Let P_k denote the operator defined by

$$(\widetilde{P_k\varphi})(\xi, r) = p_k(|\xi|)\varphi(\xi, r)$$

for any $\varphi \in C_c^\infty$. To prove inequality (3.19), we need the following

Lemma 3.6. *Let $z_0 \in b\Omega$, $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $a \in S(\mathbb{R}^{2n}_-)$ and let S be a vector field. Then, for any smooth φ with support in a neighborhood of z_0, we have*

(i) $\|f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 \cong \sum_{k=0}^\infty f(2^k)^2\|P_k\varphi\|^2$;

(ii) $\sum_{k=0}^\infty f(2^k)^2||[P_k, a]\varphi||^2 \lesssim ||\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\varphi||^2$;

(iii) $\sum_{k=0}^\infty \|[P_k, S]\varphi\|^2 \lesssim \|D_r\Lambda^{-1}\varphi\|^2 + \|\varphi\|$.

Proof. (i). We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\Lambda)\varphi\|^2 &= \int_{-\infty}^0\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} f(\Lambda_\xi)^2|\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r)|^2 d\xi dr \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} f(\Lambda_\xi)^2\Big(\sum_{k=0}^\infty p_k^2(|\xi|)\Big)|\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r)|^2 d\xi dr\end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{k=0}^\infty p_k^2 = 1$. We notice that $\Lambda_\xi = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{1/2} \cong 2^k$ as long as $|\xi|$ is in the support of p_k. Thus, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\Lambda)u\|^2 &\cong \sum_{k=0}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^0\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} f(2^k)^2|p_k(\tau)\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r)|^2 d\xi dr \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^\infty f(2^k)^2\|P_k u\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

(ii). We can choose another sequence of cutoff functions $\{q_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$ such that

1. $q_k \equiv 1$ on $\operatorname{supp}(p_k)$;
2. $q_k(t) \equiv 0$ if $t \notin (2^{k-2}, 2^{k+3})$ with $k \geq 1$ and $q_0(t) \equiv 0, t \geq 4$.

Then

$$|p_k(x) - p_k(y)| \lesssim 2^{-k} q_k(y)|x-y| \tag{3.20}$$

for any $x, y \geq 0$. Observe that

$$(\widetilde{[P_k, a]}\varphi)(\xi, r) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} \big(p_k(|\xi|) - p_k(|\tau|)\big)\tilde{a}(\xi-\tau, r)\tilde{\varphi}(\tau, r)d\tau. \tag{3.21}$$

Using (3.20), and Plancherel Theorem together with Young's Inequality, we get

$$\|[P_k, a]\varphi\|^2 \lesssim 2^{-2k}\|Q_k u\|^2 \tag{3.22}$$

where Q_k is the operator with symbol $q_k(|\xi|)$. Multiplying (3.22) by $f(2^k)^2$, taking summation over $k = 0, 1, ...$ and using the result of (i) for $f(|\xi|)$ replaced by $|\xi|^{-1}f(|\xi|)$ and P_k by Q_k, we get the conclusion of (ii).

(iii). The proof of (iii) follows immediately from (ii) by observing that $S = \sum a_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + b\frac{\partial}{\partial r}$.

$\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.5. By Theorem 3.1, we only need to estimate $\|\Lambda^{-1/2}f(\Lambda)(\mathcal{M}u^\tau)_b\|_b^2$. Let $\chi_k \in C_c^\infty(-2^{-k}, 0]$ with $0 \leq \chi_k \leq 1$ and $\chi_k(0) = 1$.

We have the elementary inequality

$$|g(0)|^2 \leq \frac{2^k}{\eta}\int_{-2^{-k}}^0 |g(r)|^2 dr + 2^{-k}\eta\int_{-2^{-k}}^0 |g'(r)|^2 dr, \tag{3.23}$$

which holds for any g such that $g(-2^{-k}) = 0$. If we apply it for $g(r) = \|\chi_k(r)P_k\mathcal{M}u^\tau(\cdot, r)\|_b$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Lambda^{-1/2}f(\Lambda)(\mathcal{M}u^\tau)_b\|_b^2 &\simeq \sum_{k=0}^\infty f(2^k)^2 2^{-k}\|\chi_k(0)P_k\mathcal{M}u^\tau(\cdot, 0)\|_b^2 \\
&\leq \underbrace{\eta^{-1}\sum_{k=0}^\infty f(2^k)^2\int_{-2^{-k}}^0 \|\chi_k P_k\mathcal{M}u^\tau(.,r)\|^2 dr}_{I} \\
&\quad \underbrace{+\eta\sum_{k=0}^\infty f(2^k)^2 2^{-2k}\int_{-2^{-k}}^0 \|D_r\Big(\chi_k P_k\mathcal{M}u^\tau(.,r)\Big)\|^2 dr}_{II},
\end{aligned}$$

where the first "$\simeq$" follows from (i) of Lemma 3.6 and the subsequent "$\le$" from (3.23). Observe that $\chi_k \le 1$ and recall Theorem 3.4 that we apply for $P_k\mathcal{M}u^\tau$ and $\delta = 2^{-k}$. Thus the first sum (I) above can be estimated by

$$\begin{aligned}(I) &\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Q(P_k u^\tau, P_k u^\tau)\\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|P_k\bar\partial u^\tau\|^2 + \|P_k\bar\partial^* u^\tau\|^2 + \|[P_k,\bar\partial]u^\tau\|^2 + \|[P_k,\bar\partial^*]u^\tau\|^2\\ &\lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau) + \|\Lambda^{-1}D_r u^\tau\|^2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

where the estimate of the commutators follows from Lemma 3.6. We remark that $D_r u^\tau$ can be expressed as a linear combination of $\bar L_n u^\tau$ and Tu^τ for some tangential vector field T. Then, similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}||\Lambda^{-1}D_r(u^\tau)||^2 &\lesssim ||\Lambda^{-1}\bar L_n u^\tau||^2 + ||\Lambda^{-1}Tu^\tau||^2\\ &\lesssim \|\bar L_n u^\tau\|^2 + ||u^\tau||^2\\ &\lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(I) \lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau).$$

We now estimate (II). Since $D_r(\chi_k) \le 2^k$, $D_rP_k = P_kD_r$ and $\chi_k \le 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}(II) \le &\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(2^k)^2 2^{-2k}\left(\int_{-2^{-k}}^{0} \|D_r(\chi_k)P_k\mathcal{M}u^\tau(.,r)\|^2 dr\right.\\ &+\left.\int_{-2^{-k}}^{0} \|\chi_k D_r(P_k\mathcal{M}u^\tau(.,r))\|^2 dr\right)\\ \le &\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(2^k)^2 \int_{-2^{-k}}^{0} \|P_k\mathcal{M}u^\tau(.,r)\|^2 dr\\ &+\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f(2^k)^2 2^{-2k}\int_{-2^{-k}}^{0} \|P_kD_r(\mathcal{M}u^\tau(.,r))\|^2 dr\\ \le &\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|^2 + \|f(\Lambda)\Lambda^{-1}D_r(\mathcal{M}u^\tau)\|^2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 3.6. We now estimate the second term in the last line of (3.25). Since $D_r = a\bar L_n + bT$, as before, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\Lambda)\Lambda^{-1}D_r(\mathcal{M}u^\tau)\|^2 &\lesssim ||f(\Lambda)\Lambda^{-1}\bar L_n\mathcal{M}u^\tau||^2 + ||f(\Lambda)\Lambda^{-1}T\mathcal{M}u^\tau||^2\\ &\lesssim \|\bar L_n u^\tau\| + C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u^\tau|||_{-1}^2 + ||f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau||^2\\ &\lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau) + C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u^\tau|||_{-1}^2 + ||f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau||^2.\end{aligned}$$

Combining all our estimates of $\|f(\Lambda)\Lambda^{-1/2}(\mathcal{M}u^\tau)_b\|_b^2$, we obtain

$$\|f(\Lambda)\Lambda^{-1/2}\mathcal{M}u_b^\tau\|_b^2 \lesssim \eta^{-1}\Big(Q(u^\tau,u^\tau)+\|u^\tau\|^2+C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u^\tau|||_{-1}^2\Big)+\eta||f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau||^2.$$

Summarizing up, we have shown that

$$||f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau|| \lesssim \eta^{-1}Q(u^\tau,u^\tau)+C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u^\tau\|_{-1}^2+\eta||f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau||^2.$$

Choosing $\eta>0$ sufficiently small, we can move the term $\eta||f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau||^2$ into the left-hand-side and get

$$||f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau||^2 \lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau)+C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u^\tau|||_{-1}^2.$$

The proof is complete.

□

The proof of Theorem 1.10 follows from Theorem 3.5 and the following

Lemma 3.7. *Let Ω be q-pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconcave) at z_0 and U be a neigborhood of z_0. For each $u\in C^\infty(U\cap\bar\Omega)^k\cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$ with $k\geq q$ (resp. $k\leq q$), assume that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ holds for u^τ. Then, $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ holds for u.*

Proof. Observe that $u^\nu|_{b\Omega}\equiv 0$; from (2.26) it follows

$$Q(u^\nu,u^\nu)\lesssim\|u^\nu\|_1^2\lesssim Q(u,u).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{cases}\|\bar\partial u^\tau\|=\|\bar\partial(u-u^\nu)\|\leq\|\bar\partial u\|+\|\bar\partial u^\nu\|\\ \|\bar\partial^* u^\tau\|=\|\bar\partial^*(u-u^\nu)\|\leq\|\bar\partial^* u\|+\|\bar\partial^* u^\nu\|.\end{cases}$$

Hence

$$Q(u^\tau,u^\tau)\leq Q(u,u)+Q(u^\nu,u^\nu)\lesssim Q(u,u). \tag{3.26}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u\| \lesssim&\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\tau\|+\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\nu\|\\ \lesssim&Q(u^\tau,u^\tau)+C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u^\tau|||_{-1}^2+\|u^\nu\|_1^2+C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u^\nu|||_{-1}^2\\ \lesssim&Q(u,u)+C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u|||_{-1}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Finally, we remark that

$$\begin{aligned}C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u|||_{-1}^2 \lesssim&\|D_r\Lambda^{-1}u\|^2\tilde C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|_{-1}^2\\ \lesssim&Q(u,u)+\tilde C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|_{-1}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.7.

□

3.4 Some remarks about $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$

In this section we make some remarks about $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$.

We recall that we write $f \gg g$ when $\lim_{\xi\to\infty} \frac{f(|\xi|)}{g(|\xi|)} = +\infty$.

Lemma 3.8. *Assume that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ holds for $f \gg g$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, $(g\text{-}\frac{1}{\epsilon}M)^k$ also holds.*

The proof of the lemma follows from Lemma 2.7.

For example, if $f \gg \log$, then $(f\text{-}1)^k$ estimate implies the superlogarithmic estimate. Similarly, if $f \gg 1$, then the $(f\text{-}1)^k$ estimate implies the compactness estimate.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}$ on $b\Omega$. Assume that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ holds; then $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}')^k$ also holds.*

Using (2.25), we get the proof of this lemma.

Lemma 3.10. *If the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate holds, then we have*

$$\|D_r\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)(\mathcal{M}u)\|^2 \lesssim Q(u,u) + C_{\mathcal{M}}|||u|||^2_{-1},$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U\cap\bar\Omega)^k \cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$.

Proof. There are functions a and b such that

$$D_r = a\bar L_n + aT,$$

where T is a tangential operator of order one. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\mathcal{M}u\|^2 \lesssim&\|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)\bar L_n(\mathcal{M}u)\|^2 + \|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)T\mathcal{M}u\|^2\\ \lesssim&\|\bar L_n u\|^2 + \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u\|^2\\ \lesssim&Q(u,u) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|^2_{-1}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

It is interesting to remark that when Ω is pseudoconvex (resp. pseudoconcave), then $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ implies $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^{k+1}$ (resp. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^{k-1}$). Notice that the similar result is not clear when Ω is q-pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconcave) in case $q_o \neq 0$ (resp. $q_o \neq n-1$).

Lemma 3.11. *Let Ω be pseudoconvex (resp. pseudoconcave) at $z_0 \in b\Omega$ and assume that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ holds. Then, $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^{k+1}$ (resp. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^{k-1}$) also holds.*

Proof. We first discuss the pseudoconvex case. Let $u = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|L|=k+1} u_L\bar{\omega}_L$ have degree $k+1$. We rewrite u as a non-ordered sum

$$u = \frac{1}{(k+1)!}\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|L|=k+1} u_L\bar{\omega}_L = \frac{(-1)^k}{k+1}\sum_{l=1}^n\Big(\frac{1}{k!}\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k} u_{lJ}\bar{\omega}_J\Big)\wedge\bar{\omega}_l.$$

For $l=1,\dots,n$, we define a set of k-forms v_l by $v_l := \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k} u_{lJ}\bar{\omega}_J$. It is easy to see that $\sum_{l=1}^n |v_l|^2 = (k+1)|u|^2$ and $\sum_{l=1}^n\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1} r_{ij}(v_l)_{iK}\overline{(v_l)}_{jK} = k\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k} r_{ij}u_{iJ}\bar{u}_{jJ}$.

Using (2.27) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{l=1}^n Q(v_l,v_l) &\simeq \sum_{l=1}^n\Big(\sum_{j=1}^n\|\bar{L}_j v_l\|^2 + \sum_{ij}\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\int_{b\Omega} r_{ij}(v_l)_{iK}\overline{(v_l)}_{jK}dS + \|vl\|^2\Big)\\ &= (k+1)\sum_{j=1}^n\|\bar{L}_j u\|^2 + k\sum_{ij}\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\int_{b\Omega} r_{ij}u_{iJ}\bar{u}_{jJ}dS + (k+1)\|u\|^2 \qquad (3.30)\\ &\simeq (k+1)Q(u,u).\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{M}\in\mathcal{A}^{0,0}$, then

$$\sum_{l=1}^n\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}v_l\|^2 = (k+1)\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u\|^2.$$

If $\mathcal{M}\in\mathcal{A}^{1,0}$, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^n|\mathcal{M}v_l|^2 = \sum_{l=1}^n\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}|\mathcal{M}_j(v_l)_{jK}|^2 = k\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}|\mathcal{M}_j u_{jJ}|^2 = k|\mathcal{M}u|^2;$$

then

$$\sum_{l=1}^n\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}v_l\|^2 = k\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u\|^2.$$

We discuss now the pseudoconcave case. Let $u = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1} u_K\bar{\omega}_K$ have degree $k-1$. For l=1,...,n, define $v_l = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1} u_K\bar{\omega}_K\wedge\bar{\omega}_l$; this has degree k. Then the proof follows the same lines as in the pseudoconvex case.

□

So far, only local estimates have been treated. If one goes to the full boundary, one has to consider local estimates over a covering. In fact, only on each local patch, the pseudodifferential operator $f(\Lambda)$ makes sense. Instead, the multiplier $\mathcal{M}$ has global meaning and thus a "global $\mathcal{M}$ estimate" is meaningful. One readily checks that this comes as the collection of the local estimates.

Theorem 3.12. *Let Ω be a bounded pseudoconvex domain. Assume that for multiplier $\mathcal{M}$ there exists a family $\{\Phi^{\mathcal{M}}\}$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} |\Phi^{\mathcal{M}}| \lesssim 1 \\ \partial\bar\partial\Phi^{\mathcal{M}}(u^\tau, u^\tau) \geq |\mathcal{M}u^\tau|^2 \end{cases} \qquad \text{on} \quad b\Omega. \tag{3.31}$$

Then,

$$\|\mathcal{M}u\|^2 \lesssim \|\bar\partial u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial^* u\|^2 + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|^2_{-1} \tag{3.32}$$

for any $u \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^k \cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$.

The proof of Theorem 3.12 follows from Theorem 1.10 and elliptic estimate for the interior of domain. In fact, from (3.31) one gets, when z leaves $b\Omega$ and enters in Ω, an error term proportional to $-\|ru^\tau\|^2$. Since $\|ru^\tau\|^2_1 \leq Q(ru^\tau, ru^\tau)$ (by ellipticity in the interior), the error term can be absorbed.

We notice that this can be obtained directly (without using Theorem 1.10) by the global method such as in Catlin [C84].

Remark 3.13. The inequality (3.32) is trivial when $\mathcal{M}$ is bounded.

Chapter 4

The $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate on the boundary

In this chapter we study the behavior of the boundary value of forms associated to the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem. Precisely, we establish a relation between the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$-estimate on Ω and $b\Omega$.

4.1 Definitions and notations

Let M be a smooth real hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$. We start by denoting by $\mathcal{A}_b^{0,k}$ the space of restriction of element of $\mathcal{A}^{0,k}\cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$ to the boundary $b\Omega$. Then $\mathcal{A}_b^{0,k}$ is the space of smooth sections of the vector bundle $\left(T^{0,1}(M)^*\right)^k$ on M.

The tangential Cauchy-Riemann operator $\bar\partial_b : \mathcal{A}_b^{0,k}\to\mathcal{A}_b^{0,k+1}$ is defined as follows. If $u\in\mathcal{A}_b^{0,k}$, let u' be a (0,k)-form whose restriction to M equals u. Then $\bar\partial_b u$ is the restriction of $\bar\partial u'$ to M.

Let $z_0\in M$ and U be a neigbourhood of z_0; we fix a defining function r of M such that $|\partial r| = 1$ on $U\cap M$. We assume that Ω is one of the two sides of $\mathbb{C}^n\setminus M$ in a neighborhood of z_0. Let $L_1, ..., L_n$ be the local basis for (1,0) vector fields defined in U, as defined in Chapter 1.

We can define a Hermitian inner product on $\mathcal{A}_b^{0,k}$ by

$$(u,v)_b=\int_M\langle u,v\rangle dS,$$

where dS is the surface element on M. The inner product gives rise to an L_2-norm $\|\cdot\|_b$.

In analogy with Chapter 2, we define $\bar\partial_b^*$ to be the L^2-adjoint of $\bar\partial_b$ in the standard way. Thus $\bar\partial_b^* : \mathcal{A}_b^{0,k+1} \to \mathcal{A}_b^{0,k}$ for $k \geq 0$. The Kohn-Laplacian is defined by

$$\Box_b = \bar\partial_b \bar\partial_b^* + \bar\partial_b^* \bar\partial_b.$$

Remember that we have already defined

$$Q_b(u,v) = (\bar\partial_b u, \bar\partial_b v)_b + (\bar\partial_b^* u, \bar\partial_b^* v)_b + (u,v)_b.$$

Denote $C_c^\infty(U \cap M)^k$ the forms of $\mathcal{A}_b^{0,k}$ with compact support in U. Let $u = \sum_{|J|=k}' u_J \bar\omega_J \in C_c^\infty(U \cap M)^k$; then on M, the operator $\bar\partial_b$ and $\bar\partial_b^*$ are expressed by

$$\bar\partial_b u = \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \bar L_j u_J \bar\omega_j \wedge \bar\omega_J + ... \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\bar\partial_b^* u = -\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{j}^{n-1} L_j u_{jK} \bar\omega_K + ... \tag{4.2}$$

where dots refer the error terms in which u is not differentiated.

In U, we choose special boundary coordinate $(x_1, ..., x_{2n-1}, r)$. Let $\xi = (\xi_1, ..., \xi_{2n-1})$ $= (\xi', \xi_{2n-1})$ be the dual coordinates to $\{x_1, ..., x_{2n-1}\}$. We also decompose $(x_1, ..., x_{2n-1})$ $= (x', x_{2n-1})$ so that $T_{z_0}^{\mathbb{C}} M$ is defined by $x_{2n-1} = 0$ in $T_{z_0}M$. Let $\psi^+ + \psi^- + \psi^0 = 1$ be a C^∞ partition of the unity in the sphere $|\xi| = 1$ such that $\psi^\pm$ are 1 at the ploles $(0, ..., \pm 1)$ and ψ^0 at the equator, that is, at $\xi_{2n-1} = 0$. We extend these functions to $\mathbb{R}^{2n-1} \setminus \{0\}$ as homogeneous functions of degree 0. We may assume that the supports of the functions ψ^+, ψ^- and ψ^0 are contained in the cones

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^+ &= \{\xi | \xi_{2n-1} > \frac{1}{2}|\xi'|\}; \\ \mathcal{C}^- &= \{\xi | -\xi_{2n-1} > \frac{1}{2}|\xi'|\}; \\ \mathcal{C}^0 &= \{\xi | |\xi_{2n-1}| < |\xi'|\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Then $\mathrm{supp}\psi^+ \subset\subset \mathcal{C}^+$, $\mathrm{supp}\psi^- \subset\subset \mathcal{C}^-$ and $\mathrm{supp}\psi^0 \subset\subset \mathcal{C}^0$.

The operators $\Psi = \Psi^{\overset{\pm}{0}}$ with symbols $\psi = \psi^{\overset{\pm}{0}}$ are defined by

$$\widetilde{\Psi\varphi}(\xi) = \psi(\xi)\tilde\varphi(\xi) \qquad \text{for} \quad \varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap M);$$

$$\widetilde{\Psi\varphi}(\xi, r) = \psi(\xi)\tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r) \qquad \text{for} \quad \varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \Omega).$$

The microlocal decomposition $\varphi = \varphi^+ + \varphi^- + \varphi^0$ of a function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap M)$ is defined by

$$\varphi = \zeta\Psi^+\varphi + \zeta\Psi^-\varphi + \zeta\Psi^0\varphi,$$

where $\zeta \in C^\infty(U'), \bar{U} \subset\subset U'$ and $\zeta \equiv 1$ on U.
For a form u, the microlocal decomposition $u = u^+ + u^- + u^0$ is accordingly defined coefficientwise. We recall some definitions from Chapter 1.

Definition 4.1. If M is a hypersurface and $z_0 \in M$, then a $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_b^k$ estimate for $(\bar\partial_b, \bar\partial_b^*)$ holds at z_0 if there exists a neighborhood U of z_0 such that

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_b^k \qquad \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u\|_b^2 \le cQ_b(u,u) + C_\mathcal{M}\|u\|_{b,-1}^2$$

for all $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap M)^k$. And an $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,+}^k$- (resp. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,-}^k$-) estimate for $(\bar\partial_b, \bar\partial_b^*)$ holds at z_0 if $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_b^k$ holds with u replaced by u^+ (resp. u^-), that is,

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,+}^k \qquad \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^+\|_b^2 \le cQ_b(u^+,u^+) + C_\mathcal{M}\|u^+\|_{b,-1}^2$$

(resp.

$$(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})_{b,-}^k \qquad \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^-\|_b^2 \le cQ_b(u^-,u^-) + C_\mathcal{M}\|u^-\|_{b,-1}^2. \quad)$$

Definition 4.2. The hypersurface M is said to be q-pseudoconvex at z_0 if either of the two components of $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus M$ is q-pseudoconvex at z_0.

Denote by $\Omega^+ = \{z \in U | r(z) < 0\}$ the q-pseudoconvex side of M and by Ω^- the other one. By Remark 2.5, $\Omega^- = \{z \in U | -r(z) < 0\}$ is $(n-q-1)$-pseudoconcave at z_0. Remember that we are choosing $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1}, \omega_n = \partial r$ as an orthonormal basis of (1,0)-forms. We also use the notation $\omega_n^\pm = \pm\partial r$ for the exterior conormal vectors to $\Omega^\pm$. We define $T = \frac{1}{2}(L_n - \bar{L}_n)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial r} = \frac{1}{2}(L_n + \bar{L}_n)$. It follows

$$L_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + T \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{L}_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial r} - T. \tag{4.4}$$

4.2 Basic microlocal estimates on $b\Omega$

In this section we prove the basic microlocal estimates on hypersurface.

In a similar way as in Proposition 2.3, we get

Lemma 4.3. *For two indices q_1, q_2 ; $(1 \le q_1 \le q_2 \le n-1)$, there is a constant C such that*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar\partial_b u\|_b^2+&\|\bar\partial_b^* u\|_b^2 + \|u\|_b^2\\ &\gtrsim \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1}(r_{ij}Tu_{iK}, u_{iK})_b - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j=q_1}^{q_2}(r_{jj}Tu_J, u_J)_b^2\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2}\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_1-1}\|\bar L_j u_J\|_b^2 + \sum_{j=q_2+1}^{n-1}\|\bar L_j u_J\|_b^2 + \sum_{j=q_1}^{q_2}\|L_j u_J\|_b^2\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

Note that, conversely, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar\partial_b u\|_b^2+&\|\bar\partial_b^* u\|_b^2\\ &\lesssim \left|\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1}(r_{ij}Tu_{iK}, u_{iK})_b - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j=q_1}^{q_2}(r_{jj}Tu_J, u_J)_b^2\right|\\ &\quad+\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_1-1}\|\bar L_j u_J\|_b^2 + \sum_{j=q_2+1}^{n-1}\|\bar L_j u_J\|_b^2 + \sum_{j=q_1}^{q_2}\|L_j u_J\|_b^2\Big) + \|u\|_b^2,\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

for all $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap M)^k$ for any k.

Lemma 4.4. *Let M be a hypersurface and z_0 a point of M. Then there is a neighborhood U of z_0 such that*

$$Q_b(u^0, u^0) \cong \|u^0\|_{b,1}^2,$$

for all $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap M)^k$ with any k.

Proof. Using twice the inequality (4.5) for $q_1 = q_2 = 0$ and $q_1 = 0, q_2 = n-1$ and taking summation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar\partial_b u\|_b^2+&\|\bar\partial_b^* u\|_b^2 + \|u\|_b^2\\ &\gtrsim \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1}(r_{ij}Tu_{iK}, u_{iK})_b - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}(r_{jj}Tu_J, u_J)_b^2\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2}\Big(\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\|L_j u_J\|_b^2 + \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\|\bar L_j u_J\|_b^2\Big)\\ &\gtrsim \|\Lambda' u\|_b^2 - \big(\epsilon + \operatorname{diam}(U)\big)\|Tu\|_b^2 - C_\epsilon\|u\|_b^2,\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where Λ' is the pseudodifferential operator of order 1 whose symbol is $(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2n-2}|\xi_j|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. To explain the last estimate in (4.7), observe that $L_j|_{z_0} = \sqrt{2}\partial_{z_j},\ j =$

$1, ..., n-1$ and that the coefficients of the L_j's are C^1; therefore, the third line of (4.7) is bounded from below by $||\Lambda' u||^2 - \text{diam}(U)\|Tu\|^2_b$. Apply (4.7) for u^0 and notice that $\|\Lambda' u^0\|^2_b \gtrsim \|Tu^0\|^2_b$. Taking U and ϵ suitably small, we conclude

$$Q_b(u^0, u^0) \gtrsim \|\Lambda' u^0\|^2_b \gtrsim \|\Lambda u^0\|^2_b.$$

On the other hand, the converse inequality is always true.

$\square$

Lemma 4.5. *Let M be a q-pseudoconvex hypersurface at z_0. Then, for a neighborhood U of z_0, and for $\zeta' \equiv 1$ over supp(ζ) and $\psi^{\pm\prime} \equiv 1$ on supp$\,\psi^{\pm}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_b(u^+, u^+) + \|\zeta' \Psi^+ u\|^2_{b,-\infty} \\
&\qquad \cong \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij=1}^{n-1} (r_{ij} \zeta' R^+ u^+_{iK}, \zeta' R^+ u^+_{iK})_b \\
(i) &\qquad\quad - \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_0} (r_{jj} \zeta' R^+ u^+_J, \zeta' R^+ u^+_J)^2_b \qquad\qquad (4.8) \\
&\qquad\quad + \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_0} \|L_j u^+_J\|^2_b + \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n-1} \|\bar{L}_j u^+_J\|^2_b + \|u^+\|^2_b + \|\Psi^+ u\|^2_{b,-\infty},
\end{aligned}$$

for all $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap M)^k$ with $k \geq q$, where R^+ is the pseudodifferential operator of order 1 whose symbol is $\xi^{\frac{1}{2}}_{2n-1} \psi^{+\prime}(\xi)$. Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_b(u^-, u^-) + \|\zeta' \Psi^- u\|^2_{b,-1} \\
&\qquad \cong \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n-1} (r_{jj} \zeta' R^- u^-_J, \zeta' R^- u^-_J)_b \\
(ii) &\qquad\quad - \sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij=1}^{n-1} (r_{ij} \zeta' R^- u^-_{iK}, \zeta' R^- u^-_{iK})_b \qquad\qquad (4.9) \\
&\qquad\quad + \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=1}^{q_0} \|\bar{L}_j u^-_J\|^2_b + \sum_{|J|=k}{}' \sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n-1} \|L_j u^-_J\|^2_b + \|u^-\|^2_b + \|\Psi^- u\|^2_{b,-\infty},
\end{aligned}$$

for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap M)^k$ with $k \leq n-1-q$, where R^- is the pseudodifferential operator of order 1 whose symbol is $(-\xi_{2n-1})^{\frac{1}{2}} \psi^{-\prime}(\xi)$.

Recall that, since M is q-pseudoconvex at z_0, then there is a defining function of M which satisfies on M

$$\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}' \sum_{ij=1}^{n-1} r_{ij} u_{iK} \bar{u}_{jK} - \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} r_{jj} |u|^2 \geq 0,$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U\cap M)^k$ with $k \geq q$, and also satisfies on M

$$\sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n-1} r_{jj}|u|^2 - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1} r_{ij}u_{iK}\bar{u}_{jK} \geq 0,$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U\cap M)^k$ with $k \leq n-q-1$, where U is a neighborhood of z_0.
Proof. (i). We have

$$\varphi^+ = \zeta\Psi^+\varphi = \zeta(\Psi^{+\prime})^2\Psi^+\varphi = (\Psi^{+\prime})^2\zeta\Psi^+\varphi + [\zeta, (\Psi^{+\prime})^2]\Psi^+\varphi.$$

Since the supports of symbols of Ψ^+ and $[\zeta, (\Psi^{+\prime})^2]$ are disjoint, the operator $[\zeta, (\Psi^{+\prime})^2]\Psi^+$ is of order $-\infty$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}(r_{ij}T\varphi^+, \varphi^+)_b =&(r_{ij}T\zeta\Psi^+\varphi, \zeta\Psi^+\varphi)_b\\ &= (r_{ij}T(\Psi^{+\prime})^2\zeta\Psi^+\varphi, \zeta\Psi^+\varphi)_b + O(\|\Psi^+\varphi\|^2_{b,-\infty})\\ &= ((\zeta')^2 r_{ij}R^{+\,*}R^+\zeta\Psi^+\varphi, \zeta\Psi^+\varphi)_b + O(\|\Psi^+\varphi\|^2_{b,-\infty})\\ &= (r_{ij}\zeta' R^+\zeta\Psi^+\varphi, \zeta' R^+\zeta\Psi^+\varphi)_b\\ &+ ([(\zeta')^2 r_{ij}, R^{+\,*}]R^+\zeta\Psi^+\varphi, \zeta\Psi^+\varphi)_b + O(\|\Psi^+\varphi\|^2_{b,-\infty}).\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

From the pseudodifferential operator calculus we get

$$([\zeta'^2 r_{ij}, R^{+*}]R^+\zeta\Psi^+\varphi, \zeta\Psi^+\varphi)_b| \lesssim \|\varphi^+\|_b^2 \tag{4.11}$$

Substituting u or u_J for φ in (4.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1}(r_{ij}Tu^+_{iK}, u^+_{iK})_b - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}(r_{jj}Tu^+_J, u^+_J)^2_b\\ =&\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1}(r_{ij}\zeta' R^+u^+_{iK}, \zeta' R^+u^+_{iK})_b - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}(r_{jj}\zeta' R^+u^+_J, \zeta' R^+u^+_J)^2_b\\ &+ O(\|u^+\|^2_b) + O(\|\Psi^+u\|^2_{b,-\infty}).\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

Since M is q-pseudoconvex, then the sum in second line in (4.12) is nonnegative if $k \geq q$. Thus the first part of Lemma 4.5 is proven by applying Lemma 4.3 to u^+ with $q_1 = 0$ and $q_2 = q_0$.

(ii). The proof of the second part is similar. We have to notice that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1}(r_{ij}Tu^-_{iK}, u^-_{iK})_b - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n-1}(r_{jj}Tu^-_J, u^-_J)^2_b\\ =&-\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1}(r_{ij}\zeta' R^-u^-_{iK}, \zeta' R^-u^-_{iK})_b + \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n-1}(r_{jj}\zeta' R^-u^-_J, \zeta' R^-u^-_J)^2_b\\ &+ O(\|u^-\|^2_b) + O(\|\Psi^-u\|^2_{b,-\infty}),\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

By Remark (2.5), the second line is nonnegative for any k-form u with $k \leq n-q-1$ and this concludes the proof.

□

4.3 Basic microlocal estimates on Ω^+ and Ω^-

In this section, we prove the basic microlocal estimates on Ω^+ and Ω^-. We begin by introducing the harmonic extension of a form from $b\Omega$ to Ω following Kohn [K86] and [K02].

In terms of special boundary coordinate (x, r), the operator L_j can be written as

$$L_j = \delta_{jn}\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \sum_k a_j^k(x,r)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}$$

for $j = 1, ..., n$. We define the tangential symbols of L_j, $1 \leq j \leq n-1$, by

$$\sigma(L_j)((x,r),\xi) = -i\sum_k a_j^k(x,r)\xi_k,$$

and

$$\sigma(T)((x,r),\xi) = \frac{-i}{2}\sum_k \big(a_n^k(x,r) - \bar{a}_n^k(x,r)\big)\xi_k.$$

Note that $\sigma(T)$ is real. We set

$$\sigma_b(L_j)(x,\xi) = \sigma(L_j)((x,0),\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_b(T)(x,\xi) = \sigma(T)((x,0),\xi)$$

and

$$\mu(x,\xi) = \sqrt{\sum_j |\sigma_b(L_j)(x,\xi)|^2 + |\sigma_b(T)(x,\xi)|^2 + 1}.$$

Remember the notation $\Lambda_\xi = (1+|\xi|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$; in a neighborhood of z_0, we have $\mu(x,\xi) \sim \Lambda_\xi^1$.

Harmonic extension is defined as follows. Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap M)$; define $\varphi^{(h)} \in C^\infty(\{(x,r) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} | r \leq 0\})$ by

$$\varphi^{(h)}(x,r) = (2\pi)^{-2n+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} e^{ix\cdot\xi}e^{r\mu(x,\xi)}\tilde{\varphi}(\xi)d\xi,$$

so that $\varphi^{(h)}(x,0)=\varphi(x)$. This extension is called "harmonic" since $\triangle\varphi^{(h)}(x,r)$ has order 1 on M. In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\triangle &= -\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_j\partial\bar z_j}\\ &= -\sum_{j=1}^{n}L_j\bar L_j+\sum_{k=1}^{2n-1}a^k(x,r)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}+a(x,r)\frac{\partial}{\partial r} \qquad (4.14)\\ &= -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 r}+T^2-\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}L_j\bar L_j+\sum_{k=1}^{2n-1}b^k(x,r)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}+b(x,r)\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\end{aligned}$$

since (4.6) implies that $L_n\bar L_n=\frac{\partial^2}{\partial^2 r}-T^2+D$, where D is a first order operator. Hence if $(x,r)\in U\cap\bar\Omega^+$,

$$\triangle(\varphi^{(h)})(x,r)=(2\pi)^{(2n-1)}\int e^{ix\cdot\xi}e^{r\mu(x,\xi)}\big(p^1(x,r,\xi)+rp^2(x,r,\xi)\tilde\varphi(\xi,0)\big)d\xi. \qquad (4.15)$$

For future use, we prepare the notation P^1+rP^2 for the pseudodifferential operator with symbol p^1+rp^2 which appears in the right of (4.15). Along with (4.15) we have

$$L_j\varphi^{(h)}(x,r)=(L_j\varphi)^h(x,r)+E_j\varphi(x,r)$$

where

$$E_j\varphi(x,r)=(2\pi)^{(2n-1)}\int e^{ix\cdot\xi}e^{r\mu(x,\xi)}\big(p^0_j(x,r,\xi)+rp^1_j(x,r,\xi)\tilde\varphi(\xi)\big)d\xi$$

and

$$\bar L_j\varphi^{(h)}(x,r)=(\bar L_j\varphi)^h(x,r)+\bar E_j\varphi(x,r)$$

for $j=1,...,n-1$.

Lemma 4.6. *For any $k\in\mathbb{Z}$ with $k\geq 0$, $s\in\mathbb{R}$, and $f\in\mathcal{F}$ we have*

(i) $|||r^kf(\Lambda)\varphi^{(h)}|||_s\underset{\sim}{<}\|f(\Lambda)\varphi\|_{b,s-k-\frac{1}{2}}$,

(ii) $|||D_rf(\Lambda)\varphi^{(h)}|||_s\underset{\sim}{<}\|f(\Lambda)\varphi\|_{b,s+\frac{1}{2}}$

for any $\varphi\in C^\infty_c(U\cap\bar\Omega^+)$.

Proof. We notice again that $\mu(x,\xi)\cong(1+|\xi|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ over a small neighborhood of z_0, and then the proof of this lemma is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.10.

□

We define φ_b to be the restriction of $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega}^+)$ to the boundary. We have the elementary estimate

$$\|\varphi_b\|^2_{b,s} \lesssim |||\varphi|||^2_{s+\frac{1}{2}} + |||D_r\varphi|||^2_{s-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.16}$$

The following lemma states the basic microlocal estimates on Ω^+.

Lemma 4.7. *Let Ω^+ be q-pseudoconvex at z_0. If U is a sufficiently small neighborhood of z_0, then we have the three estimates which follow*

$$|||\Psi^0\varphi|||^2_1 \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} \|L_j\Psi^0\varphi\|^2 + \sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n} \|\bar{L}_j\Psi^0\varphi\| + \|\Psi^0\varphi\|^2$$
$$\textit{for any } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega}^+), \tag{4.17}$$

$$|||\Psi^-\varphi|||^2_1 \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} \|L_j\Psi^-\varphi\|^2 + \sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n} \|\bar{L}_j\Psi^-\varphi\| + \|\Psi^-\varphi\|^2$$
$$\textit{for any } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega}^+), \tag{4.18}$$

$$|||\bar{L}_n\Psi^+\varphi^{(h)}|||^2_{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} \|L_j\Psi^+\varphi\|^2_b + \sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n-1} \|\bar{L}_j\Psi^+\varphi\|^2_b + \|\Psi^+\varphi\|^2_b$$
$$\textit{for any } \varphi \in C_c^\infty(U \cap b\Omega^+). \tag{4.19}$$

Proof. We start from (4.17). Since supp $\psi^0 \subset \mathcal{C}^0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(1+|\xi'|^2)|\psi^0(\xi)|^2 &\lesssim \left(1+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}|\sigma(L_j)|^2((0,0),\xi)\right)|\psi^0(\xi)|^2\\
&\lesssim \left(1+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}|\sigma(L_j)|^2((x,r),\xi)\right)|\psi^0(\xi)|^2\\
&\quad+\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}|\sigma(L_j)|^2((0,0),\xi)-\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}|\sigma(L_j)|^2((x,r),\xi)\right)|\psi^0(\xi)|^2\\
&\lesssim \left(1+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}|\sigma(L_j)|^2((x,r),\xi)\right)|\psi^0(\xi)|^2\\
&\quad+\operatorname{diam}(\bar{\Omega}^+\cap U)\left(1+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}|\xi_j|^2\right)|\psi^0(\xi)|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Lambda\Psi^0\varphi\|_1^2 \lesssim &\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|L_j\Psi^0\varphi\|^2+\sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n}\|\bar{L}_j\Psi^0\varphi\|^2\\ &+\|\Psi^0\varphi\|^2+\operatorname{diam}(U\cap\bar{\Omega}^+)\sum_{j=1}^{2n-1}\|D_j\Psi^0\varphi\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.21}$$

The estimate (4.17) follows from (4.21) by taking U sufficiently small so that the last term is absorbed in the left hand side of the estimate.

We pass to prove (4.18). For all $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(U\cap\bar{\Omega}^+)$, let $\varphi^{(h)}$ be the harmonic extension of $\varphi_b=\varphi|_{U\cap b\Omega^+}$. We have

$$|||\Psi^-\varphi|||_1^2\lesssim\|\Psi^-(\varphi-\varphi^{(h)})\|_1^2+|||\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}|||_1^2.\tag{4.22}$$

We estimate now $|||\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}|||_1^2$; we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{L}_n\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}(x,r)=&(2\pi)^{(2n-1)}\int e^{ix\cdot\xi}e^{r(\mu(x,\xi))}\Big(\mu(x,\xi)-\sigma_b(T)(x,\xi)\\ &\qquad+rp^1(x,\xi)\Big)\psi^-(\xi)\tilde{\varphi}(\xi,0)d\xi\end{aligned}\tag{4.23}$$

where $p^1(x,\xi)$ is the symbol which appears in (4.15) and whose associated operator we have denoted by P^1. Choosing U sufficiently small we have $\sigma(T)_b(x,\xi)\leq 0$ when $\xi\in\operatorname{supp}(\psi^-)\subset\mathcal{C}^-$. Then,

$$\mu(x,\xi)-\sigma_b(T)(x,\xi)\gtrsim|\xi|+1.$$

It follows

$$|||\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}|||_1^2\lesssim\|\bar{L}_n\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}\|^2+\|rP^1\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}\|^2.\tag{4.24}$$

Applying Lemma 4.6 and inequality (4.16) to the second term in (4.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|rP_1\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}\|^2\lesssim&\|\Lambda^{-1/2}\Psi^-\varphi\|_b^2\\ \lesssim&\|\Lambda^{-1}D_r\Psi^-\varphi\|^2+\|\Psi^-\varphi\|^2\\ \lesssim&\|\bar{L}_n\Psi^-\varphi\|^2+\|\Psi^-\varphi\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.25}$$

For the first term in (4.24), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{L}_n\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}\|^2\lesssim&\|\bar{L}_n\Psi^-(\varphi-\varphi^{(h)})\|^2+\|\bar{L}_n\Psi^-\varphi\|^2\\ \lesssim&\|\Psi^-(\varphi-\varphi^{(h)})\|_1^2+\|\bar{L}_n\Psi^-\varphi\|^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.26}$$

Combining (4.22), (4.24), (4.25) and (4.26), we get

$$|||\Psi^-\varphi|||_1^2 \lesssim \|\Psi^-(\varphi-\varphi^{(h)})\|_1^2 + \|\bar{L}_n\Psi^-\varphi\|^2 + \|\Psi^-\varphi\|^2. \tag{4.27}$$

Finally, we estimate $\|\Psi^-(\varphi-\varphi^{(h)})\|_1^2$. Since $\Psi^-(\varphi-\varphi^{(h)})=0$ on $U\cap b\Omega$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Psi^-(\varphi-\varphi^{(h)})\|_1^2 \lesssim& \|\Delta\Psi^-(\varphi-\varphi^{(h)})\|_{-1}^2\\ \lesssim&\|\Delta\Psi^-\varphi\|_{-1}^2+\|\Delta\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}\|_{-1}^2\\ \lesssim&\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|\bar{L}_jL_j\Psi^-\varphi\|_{-1}^2+\sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n}\|L_j\bar{L}_j\Psi^-\varphi\|_{-1}^2\\ &+\|P^1\Psi^-\varphi\|_{-1}^2+\|(rP^2+P^1)\Psi^-\varphi^{(h)}\|_{-1}^2\\ \lesssim&\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|L_j\Psi^-\varphi\|^2+\sum_{j=q_0+1}^{n}\|\bar{L}_j\Psi^-\varphi\|^2+\|\Psi^-\varphi\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

Here the third inequality in (4.28) follows from (4.15). This completes the proof of (4.22).

We prove now (4.19). For any $\varphi\in C_c^\infty(U\cap b\Omega^+)$, we have

$$\bar{L}_n\Psi^+\varphi^{(h)}(x,r)=(2\pi)^{(2n-1)}\int e^{ix\cdot\xi}e^{r(\mu(x,\xi))}\Big(\mu(x,\xi)-\sigma_b(T)(x,\xi)+rp^1(x,\xi)\Big)\psi^+(\xi)\tilde{\varphi}(\xi,0)d\xi. \tag{4.29}$$

Choosing U sufficiently small we have $\sigma_b(T)(x,\xi)>0$ when $\xi\in\text{supp}\psi^+\subset\mathcal{C}^+$. So that

$$\mu-\sigma_b(T)=\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\frac{\sigma_b(\bar{L}_j)}{\mu+\sigma_b(T)}\sigma_b(L_j)+\sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n-1}\frac{\sigma_b(L_j)}{\mu+\sigma_b(T)}\sigma_b(\bar{L}_j).$$

Since the symbols

$$\Big\{\frac{\sigma_b(\bar{L}_j)}{\mu+\sigma_b(T)}\Big\}_{j\le q_o}\qquad\text{and}\qquad\Big\{\frac{\sigma_b(L_j)}{\mu+\sigma_b(T)}\Big\}_{q_o+1\le j\le n-1}$$

are absolutely bounded, then

$$|\mu-\sigma_b(T)|\lesssim|\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}\sigma_b(L_j)|+|\sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n-1}\sigma_b(\bar{L}_j)|. \tag{4.30}$$

Hence, from (4.29) and (4.30) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |||\bar{L}_n\Psi^+\varphi^{(h)}|||^2_{\frac{1}{2}} &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} |||(L_j\Psi^+\varphi)^h|||_{\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n-1} |||(L_j\Psi^+\varphi)^h|||_{\frac{1}{2}} + |||rP_1\Psi^+\varphi^{(h)}|||^2_{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^{q_o} ||L_j\Psi^+\varphi||^2_b + \sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n-1} ||L_j\Psi^+\varphi||^2_b + \|\Psi^+\varphi\|^2_b. \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

□

Using Lemma 4.7 for coefficients of forms, we obtain

Lemma 4.8. *Let Ω^+ be a q-pseudoconvex at z_0. Then, for a suitable neighborhood U of z_0 and for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar{\Omega}^+)^k \cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$ with $k \geq q$, we have*

(i)

$$|||\Psi^0 u|||^2_1 + |||\Psi^- u|||^2_1 \lesssim Q(u, u).$$

Moreover, for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap b\Omega^+)^k$ with $k \geq q$, we have

$$|||\bar{L}_n\Psi^+(u^+)^{(h)}|||^2_{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim Q_b(u^+, u^+).$$

Similarly, we get the basic microlocal estimates for Ω^-.

Lemma 4.9. *Let Ω^- be $(n-1-q)$-pseudoconcave at z_0. Then, for a suitable neighborhood U of z_0 and for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U\cap\bar{\Omega}^-)^k \cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$ with $k \leq n-1-q$, we have*

$$|||\Psi^0 u|||^2_1 + |||\Psi^+ u|||^2_1 \lesssim Q(u, u).$$

Moreover, for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap b\Omega^-)^k$ with $k \leq n-1-q$, we have

$$|||\bar{L}_n\Psi^-(u^-)^{(h)}|||^2_{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim Q_b(u^-, u^-).$$

4.4 The equivalence of $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate on Ω and $b\Omega$

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.13. This is a consequence of the three theorems which follow, that is, Theorem 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12.

Theorem 4.10. *Let $\Omega^+ \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a smooth q-pseudoconvex domain with boundary $M = b\Omega$ at $z_0 \in b\Omega$. Then*

- *(i) $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k_{\Omega^+}$ implies $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^k_{b,+}$ where $\mathcal{N}$ is the restriction of $\mathcal{M}$ to M.*
- *(ii) $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^k_{b,+}$ implies $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k_{\Omega^+}$ where $\mathcal{M}$ is any extension of $\mathcal{N}$ from M to Ω, that is, $\mathcal{M}\big|_M = \mathcal{N}$.*

Proof. (i). We need to show that over a neighborhood U of z_0 we have

$$\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}u^+\|_b^2 \lesssim Q_b(u^+,u^+) + C_{\mathcal{N}}\|u^+\|_{b,-1}^2 + \|\Psi^+u\|_{b,-\infty}^2$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U\cap M)^k$. Let $\chi = \chi(r)$ be a cut off function with $\chi(0) = 1$. Applying inequality (4.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}u^+\|_b^2 \lesssim& \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\chi f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^{+\,(h)}\|^2 + \|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}D_r(\chi f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^{+\,(h)})\|^2\\ \lesssim& \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}\chi\zeta' R^+u^{+\,(h)}\|^2\\ &+ \|\Lambda^{-1}f(\Lambda)D_r(\mathcal{M}\chi\zeta' R^+u^{+\,(h)})\|^2 + error,\end{aligned}\tag{4.32}$$

where $\zeta' = 1$ on $\mathrm{supp}(u^+)$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\chi\zeta') \subset\subset U'$. Here, the error term is estimated by

$$error \lesssim \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}u^{+\,(h)}\|^2 + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}u^{+\,(h)}\|_{-1}^2 + \|\Psi^+u^{(h)}\|_{-\infty}^2.$$

Notice that $\chi\zeta' R^+u^{+\,(h)} \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$. Using the hypothesis of the theorem to estimate the second line of (4.32) and applying Lemma 3.10 to the second term in the last line of (4.32), we have that (4.32) can be continued by

$$\begin{aligned}\lesssim& Q(\chi\zeta' R^+u^{+\,(h)}, \chi\zeta' R^+u^{+\,(h)}) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|\chi\zeta' R^+u^{+\,(h)}\|_{-1}^2 + error\\ \lesssim& \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij}^{n-1}(r_{ij}\zeta' R^+u^+_{iK}, \zeta' R^+u^+_{jK})_b - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}(r_{jj}\zeta' R^+u^+_J, \zeta' R^+u^+_J)_b\\ &+ \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|L_j\chi\zeta' R^+u_J^{(h)+}\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n}\|\bar L_j\chi\zeta' R^+u_J^{(h)+}\|^2\Big)\\ &+ \|\chi\zeta' R^+u^{+\,(h)}\|^2 + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|\chi\zeta' R^+u^{+\,(h)}\|_{-1}^2 + error\\ \lesssim& Q_b(u^+,u^+) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u^+\|_{b,-1}^2 + \|\Psi^+u\|_{b,-\infty}^2\\ &+ \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(L_ju_J^+)^{(h)}\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar L_ju_J^+)^{(h)}\|^2\Big) + \|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\bar L_n\Psi^+(u^+)^{(h)}\|^2\\ \lesssim& Q_b(u^+,u^+) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u^+\|_{b,-1}^2 + \|\Psi^+u\|_{b,-\infty}^2,\end{aligned}\tag{4.33}$$

where the second inequality follows from (2.27), the third from Lemma 4.5 and the last from Lemma 4.8.

(ii). For any $u \in C_c^\infty(U\cap\bar\Omega)^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$, we decompose $u = u^\tau + u^\nu$ and $u^\tau = u^{\tau\,+} + u^{\tau\,-} + u^{\tau\,0}$. Since u^ν satisfies elliptic estimates and on account of Lemma 4.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^\nu\|^2 &\le |||u^\nu|||_1^2 + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u^\nu\|_{-1}^2 \lesssim Q(u,u) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|_{-1}^2,\\ \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^{\tau\,0}\|^2 &\le |||u^{\tau\,0}|||_1^2 + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u^{\tau\,0}\|_{-1}^2 \lesssim Q(u,u) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|_{-1}^2,\\ \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^{\tau\,-}\|^2 &\le |||u^{\tau\,-}|||_1^2 + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u^{\tau\,-}\|_{-1}^2 \lesssim Q(u,u) + C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|_{-1}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.34}$$

Moreover, by Theorem 3.1 and (3.26), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^{\tau+}\|^2 \lesssim&\|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}u_b^{\tau+}\|_b^2+Q(u^\tau,u^\tau)+C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u^\tau\|_{-1}^2\\ \lesssim&\|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}u_b^{\tau+}\|_b^2+Q(u,u)+C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|_{-1}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.35}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u\|^2 \lesssim&\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^{\tau+}\|^2+\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^{\tau-}\|^2+\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^{\tau 0}\|^2+\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{M}u^{\nu}\|^2\\ \lesssim&\|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}u_b^{\tau+}\|_b^2+Q(u,u)+C_{\mathcal{M}}\|u\|_{-1}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.36}$$

Hence, we only need to estimate $\|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}u_b^{\tau+}\|_b^2$. We begin by noticing that

$$\|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}u_b^{\tau+}\|_b^2 \lesssim \|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+}\|_b^2+error,\tag{4.37}$$

where $\zeta'\equiv 1$ over $\mathrm{supp}u^{\tau+}$. Using the hypothesis we can continue (4.37) by

$$\begin{aligned}&\lesssim Q_b(\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+},\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+})+C_{\mathcal{M}}\|\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+}\|_{b,-1}^2+error\\ &\lesssim \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1}(r_{ij}\zeta'R^+(\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+})_{iK},\zeta'R^+(\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+})_{jK})_b\\ &\quad\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|L_j(\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+})_J\|_b^2+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\|\bar L_j(\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+})_J\|_b^2\Big)\\ &\quad+\|\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+}\|_b^2+C_{\mathcal{M}}\|\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+}\|_{b,-1}^2+\|\Psi^+\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau}\|_{b,-\infty}^2+error\\ &\lesssim Q(\zeta''R^+\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\zeta\Psi^+u^\tau,\zeta''R^+\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\zeta\Psi^+u^\tau)\\ &\quad\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|J|=k}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_0}\|\zeta'L_j\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u_b^{\tau+})_J\|_b^2+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\|\zeta'\bar L_j\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}(u_b^{\tau+})_J\|_b^2\Big)\\ &\quad+\|\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+}\|_b^2+\tilde C_{\mathcal{M}}\|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_b^{\tau+}\|_{b,-1}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{4.38}$$

Since $\zeta''R^+\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\zeta\Psi^+$ is a tangential pseudodifferential operators of order zero, then

$$Q(\zeta''R^+\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\zeta\Psi^+u^\tau,\zeta''R^+\zeta'\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\zeta\Psi^+u^\tau)\lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau).$$

To estimate the last two lines we proceed as follows. For $j\le q_0$, since $\zeta'L_j\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u^{+\tau}\in C_c^\infty(U\cap\bar\Omega)$, then using inequality (4.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\zeta'L_j\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u^{+\tau}\|_b^2 \lesssim&\|\Lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\zeta'L_j\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u^{+\tau}\|^2+\|\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\zeta'L_j\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u^{+\tau}\|^2\\ \lesssim&\|L_ju^{+\tau}\|^2+\|\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Lambda^{-1}L_ju^{+\tau}\|^2+error\\ \lesssim&\|L_ju^{+\tau}\|^2+\|T\Lambda^{-1}L_ju^{+\tau}\|^2+\|\bar L_n\Lambda^{-1}L_ju^{+\tau}\|^2+error\\ \lesssim&\|L_ju^{+\tau}\|^2+\|\bar L_nu^{+\tau}\|^2+error\\ \lesssim&Q(u^{+\tau},u^{+\tau})\lesssim Q(u^\tau,u^\tau).\end{aligned}\tag{4.39}$$

The same estimate holds for each term $\|\zeta'\bar{L}_j\Lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}u^{+\tau}\|_b^2$ for $q_0+1\leq j\leq n-1$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.10.

$\square$

Similarly, we get the equivalence of $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ on Ω^- and M

Theorem 4.11. *Let Ω^- be a smooth q-pseudoconcave domain at $z_0\in b\Omega$. Then $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k_{\Omega^-}$ is equivalent to $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^k_{b,-}$ for $\mathcal{M}|_M=\mathcal{N}$.*

Let M be q-pseudoconvex. Recall that this means that one of the two sides of $\mathbb{C}^n\setminus M$ is q-pseudoconvex (or equivalently, the complementary side is $(n-1-q)$-pseudoconcave).

Theorem 4.12. *Let M be a q-pseudoconvex hypersurface at z_0. Then $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^k_{b,+}$ holds if and only if $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^{n-1-k}_{b,-}$ holds.*

Proof. We define the local conjugate-linear duality map $F^k:\mathcal{A}_b^{0,k}\to\mathcal{A}_b^{0,n-1-k}$ as follows. If $u=\sum'_{|J|=k}u_J\bar{\omega}_J$ then

$$F^k u=\sum\epsilon^{\{J,J'\}}_{\{1,\dots,n-1\}}\bar{u}_J\bar{\omega}_{J'},$$

where J' denotes the strictly increasing $(n-k-1)$-tuple consisting of all integers in $[1,n-1]$ which do not belong to J and $\epsilon^{J,J'}_{\{1,n-1\}}$ is the sign of the permutation $\{J,J'\}\overset{\sim}{\to}\{1,\dots,n-1\}$.

Since $\overline{(\varphi^+)}=(\overline{\varphi})^-$, then

$$F^k u^+=\sum\epsilon^{\{J,J'\}}_{\{1,\dots,n-1\}}(\bar{u})^-_J\bar{\omega}_{J'}.$$

Also, $F^{n-1-k}F^k u^+=u^+$, $\|F^k u^+\|=\|u^-\|$ and finally

$$\bar{\partial}_b F^k u^+=F^{k-1}\bar{\partial}_b^* u^+ +\cdots$$

and

$$\bar{\partial}_b^* F^k u^+=F^{k+1}\bar{\partial}_b u^+ +\cdots$$

where dots refers the term in which u is not differentiated. Hence

$$Q_b(F^k u^+,F^k u^+)\cong Q_b(u^+,u^+).$$

On the other hand, we also have $\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}F^k u^+\|^2=\|f(\Lambda)\mathcal{N}u^-\|^2$.

$\square$

Corollary 4.13. *Let M be a pseudoconvex hypersurface at z_0, let $\mathcal{N} \in C^\infty(M)$ and let $\mathcal{M}$ be any extension of $\mathcal{N}$ from M to $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then, for $1 \le k \le n-2$, the estimate $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^k_b$ holds if one of the following conditions is satisfied*

1. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^k_{b,+}$ *and* $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^k_{b,-}$
2. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^k_{b,+}$ *and* $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^{n-1-k}_{b,+}$
3. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^l_{b,+}$ *for* $l \le \min\{k, n-1-k\}$
4. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^l_{b,-}$ *for* $l \ge \max\{k, n-1-k\}$
5. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k_{\Omega^+}$ *and* $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k_{\Omega^-}$
6. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k_{\Omega^+}$ *and* $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^{n-1-k}_{\Omega^+}$
7. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^l_{\Omega^+}$ *for* $l \le \min(k, n-1-k)$
8. $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^l_{\Omega^-}$ *for* $l \ge \max(k, n-1-k)$.

Proof. The equivalence of $(f\text{-}\mathcal{N})^k_b$ to (1), (2), (3) and (4) follows from Theorem 4.12 combined with the fact that $\|u^0\|^2_{1\,b} \underset{\sim}{<} Q_b(u,u)$. The equivalence of these conditions to (5), (6), (7) and (8) follows from Theorems 4.10 and 4.11.

$\square$

Chapter 5

Geometric and analytic consequences of $(f\text{-}M)^k$ estimate

The chapter is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.14.

5.1 Estimates with a 1-parameter family of cutoff functions

Let Ω be a domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let U be a neighborhood of a given point $z_0 \in b\Omega$. Choose real coordinates $(x_1, ..., x_{2n-1}, r)$ in U. Let χ_0, χ_1, χ_2 be cutoff functions supported in U such that $\chi_j \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of the support of χ_{j-1} for $j = 1, 2$. For every $t \in (0, 1]$, we define two new cutoff functions χ_j^t such that $\chi_j^t(z) = \chi_j(\frac{z}{t})$ for $j = 0, 1, 2$. The main tool in the proof of Theorem 1.14 is the following

Theorem 5.1. *Let Ω, U, χ_j^t, $j = 0, 1, 2$ be as above. Assume that $(f\text{-}1)^k$ holds in a neighborhood U with $f \gg \log$. Then, for any positive integer s, we have*

$$\|\chi_0^t u\|_s^2 \lesssim t^{-2s}\|\chi_1^t \Box u\|_s^2 + (g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(s+1)}\|\chi_2^t u\|^2, \tag{5.1}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{A}^{0,k} \cap Dom(\Box)$, where $g = \frac{f}{\log}$ and g^* is the inverse function to g.

Remark 5.2. In [C83], Catlin proves the same statement for the particular choice $f(|\xi|) = |\xi|^\epsilon$ ending up with a g in (5.1) which is f itself. In fact, starting from subelliptic estimates, (5.1) is obtained by induction over j such that $j\epsilon \geq s$. For us, who use Kohn method of [K02], a loss of sharpness, that is, $g = \frac{f}{\log}$ instead of f, is unavoidable.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. For each integer $s \geq 0$, we interpolate two sequences of cutoff functions $\{\zeta_m\}_{m=0}^s$ and $\{\sigma_m\}_{m=1}^s$ with support on U and such that $\zeta_j \equiv 1$ on

$\operatorname{supp}\zeta_{j+1}$ and $\sigma_j \equiv 1$ on $\operatorname{supp}\zeta_j$. We define two new sequences $\{\zeta^t_m\}$ and $\{\sigma^t_m\}$ by $\zeta^t_m(z) = \zeta_m(\frac{z}{t})$ and $\sigma^t_m(z) = \sigma_m(\frac{z}{t})$. In our conclusion, we take χ_1 as ζ_0 and χ_0 as ζ_s.

We also need a pseudodifferential partition of the unity. Let $\lambda_1(|\xi|)$ and $\lambda_2(|\xi|)$ be real valued C^∞ functions such that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \equiv 1$ and

$$\lambda_1(|\xi|) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\xi| \le 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } |\xi| \ge 2. \end{cases}$$

Recall that Λ^m is the tangential pseudodifferential operator of order m. Denote by Λ^m_t the pseudodifferential operator with symbol $\lambda_2(t|\xi|)(1+|\xi|^2)^{\frac{m}{2}}$ and by E_t the operator with symbol $\lambda_1(t|\xi|)$. Note that

$$\|\Lambda^m \zeta^t_m u\|^2 \lesssim \|\Lambda^m_t \zeta^t_m u\|^2 + t^{-2m}\|\zeta^t_m u\|^2. \tag{5.2}$$

In this estimate, it is understood that $t^{-1} \le g^*(t^{-1})$.

For $m = 1, 2, \dots$, we define the pseudodifferential operator R^m_t by

$$R^m_t \varphi(x,r) = (2\pi)^{-2(n-1)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n-1}} e^{ix\cdot\xi} \lambda_2(t|\xi|)(1+|\xi|^2)^{\frac{m\sigma^t_m(x,r)}{2}} \tilde{\varphi}(\xi, r) d\xi$$

for $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar{\Omega})$. Since the symbol of $(\Lambda^m_t - R^m_t)\zeta^t_m$ is of order zero, then

$$\begin{aligned} ||\Lambda^m_t \zeta^t_m u||^2 \lesssim & \|R^m_t \zeta^t_m u\|^2 + \|\zeta^t_m u\|^2 \\ \lesssim & \|\zeta^t_m R^m_t \zeta^t_{m-1} u\|^2 + \|[R^m_t, \zeta^t_m]\zeta^t_{m-1} u\|^2 + \|\zeta^t_m u\|^2 \\ \lesssim & \|f(\Lambda)\zeta^t_{m-1} R^m_t \zeta^t_{m-1} u\|^2 + \|[R^m_t, \zeta^t_m]\zeta^t_{m-1} u\|^2 + \|\zeta^t_m u\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

By Proposition 5.3 which follows, the commutator in the last line of (5.3) is dominated by $\sum_{j=1}^m t^{-2j}|||\zeta^t_{m-j} u|||^2_{m-j}$. From (5.2) and (5.3), we get

$$|||\zeta^t_m u|||^2_m \lesssim \|f(\Lambda)\zeta^t_{m-1} R^m_t \zeta^t_{m-1} u\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m t^{-2j}|||\zeta^t_{m-j} u|||^2_{m-j}. \tag{5.4}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} |||D_r\Lambda^{-1}\zeta^t_m u|||^2_m \lesssim & \|D_r\Lambda^{-1} f(\Lambda)\zeta^t_{m-1} R^m_t \zeta^t_{m-1} u\|^2 \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^m t^{-2j}|||D_r\Lambda^{-1}\zeta^t_{m-j} u|||^2_{m-j}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Denote $A^m_t = \zeta^t_{m-1} R^m_t \zeta^t_{m-1}$ and remark that A^m_t is self-adjoint; also, we have $A^m_t u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k \cap \operatorname{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$ if $u \in \mathcal{A}^{0,k} \cap \operatorname{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$. Using the hypothesis and Lemma 3.10, we obtain

$$\|f(\Lambda)A^m_t u\|^2 + \|D_r\Lambda^{-1} f(\Lambda) A^m_t u\|^2 \lesssim Q(A^m_t u, A^m_t u) \tag{5.6}$$

Next, we estimate $Q(A_t^m u, A_t^m u)$. We have

$$\|\bar\partial A_t^m u\|^2 = (A_t^m\bar\partial u, \bar\partial A_t^m u) + ([\bar\partial, A_t^m]u, \bar\partial A_t^m u). \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(A_t^m\bar\partial u, \bar\partial A_t^m u) = (A_t^m\bar\partial^*\bar\partial u, A_t^m u) + ([\bar\partial, A_t^m]^* u, \bar\partial^* A_t^m u)\\ + (f(\Lambda)^{-1}[[A_t^m, \bar\partial^*]^*, \bar\partial]u, f(\Lambda)A_t^m u).\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Combination of (5.7) and (5.8) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar\partial A_t^m u\|^2 = (A_t^m\bar\partial^*\bar\partial u, A_t^m u) + ([\bar\partial, A_t^m]^* u, \bar\partial^* A_t^m u)\\ + (f(\Lambda)^{-1}[[A_t^m, \bar\partial^*]^*, \bar\partial]u, f(\Lambda)A_t^m u) + ([\bar\partial, A_t^m]u, \bar\partial A_t^m u).\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar\partial^* A_t^m u\|^2 =&(A_t^m\bar\partial\bar\partial^* u, A_t^m u) + ([\bar\partial^*, A_t^m]^* u, \bar\partial A_t^m u)\\ &+ (f(\Lambda)^{-1}[[A_t^m, \bar\partial]^*, \bar\partial^*]u, f(\Lambda)A_t^m u) + ([\bar\partial^*, A_t^m]u, \bar\partial^* A_t^m u)\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Taking summation of (5.9) and (5.10), and using the "small constant - large constant" inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}Q(A_t^m u, A_t^m u) \lesssim&\|A_t^m\Box u\|^2 + error\\ \lesssim&|||\zeta_{m-1}^t\Box u|||_m^2 + error,\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}error =&\|[\bar\partial, A_t^m]u\|^2 + \|[\bar\partial^*, A_t^m]u\|^2 + \|[\bar\partial, A_t^m]^* u\| + \|[\bar\partial^*, A_t^m]^* u\|\\ &+ \|f(\Lambda)^{-1}[A_t^m, \bar\partial]^*, \bar\partial^*]u\|^2 + \|f(\Lambda)^{-1}[A_t^m, \bar\partial^*]^*, \bar\partial]u\|^2 + \|A_t^m u\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Using Proposition 5.3 (see below), the error terms are dominated by

$$\epsilon Q(A_t^m u, A_t^m u) + C_\epsilon(g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(m+1)}\|\chi_2^t u\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m t^{-2j}\|\zeta_{m-j}^t u\|_{m-j}^2.$$

Therefore

$$Q(A_t^m u, A_t^m u) \lesssim |||\zeta_{m-1}^t\Box u|||_m^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m t^{-2j}\|\zeta_{m-j}^t u\|_{m-j}^2 + (g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(m+1)}\|\chi_2^t u\|^2 \tag{5.13}$$

Combining (5.4), (5.5), (5.6) and (5.13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|||\zeta^t_m u|||^2_m + |||D_r\Lambda^{-1}\zeta^t_m u|||^2_m \lesssim & |||\zeta^t_{m-1}\Box u|||^2_m \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{m} t^{-2j}||\zeta^t_{m-j}u||^2_{m-j} + (g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(m+1)}\|\chi^t_2 u\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Since the operator $\Box$ is elliptic, and therefore non-characteristic with respect to the boundary, we have for $m \geq 2$

$$\|\zeta^t_m u\|^2_m \lesssim \|\Box\zeta^t_m u\|^2_{m-2} + |||\zeta^t_m u|||^2_m + |||D_r\Lambda^{-1}\zeta^t_m u|||^2_m. \tag{5.15}$$

Replace the first term in the right of (5.15) by $\|\zeta^t_m\Box u\|^2_{m-2} + \|[\Box, \zeta^t_m]u\|^2_{m-2}$ and observe that the commutator is estimated by $t^{-2}\|\zeta^t_{m-1}u\|^2_{m-1} + t^{-4}\|\zeta^t_{m-1}u\|^2_{m-2}$. Using also (5.14), we get

$$\|\zeta^t_m u\|^2_m \lesssim \|\zeta^t_{m-1}\Box u\|^2_m + \sum_{j=1}^{m} t^{-2j}||\zeta^t_{m-j}u||^2_{m-j} + (g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(m+1)}\|\chi^t_2 u\|^2 \tag{5.16}$$

for $m = 2, ..., s$ (the cases $m = 1$ being trivial).

Iterated use of (5.16) to estimate the terms of type $\zeta^t_{m-j}u$ by those of type $\zeta^t_{m-1}\Box u$ in the right side yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|\zeta^t_s u\|^2_s &\lesssim \sum_{m=0}^{s} t^{-2m}\|\zeta^t_{s-m}\Box u\|^2_{s-m} + (g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(s+1)}\|\chi^t_2 u\|^2 \\ &\lesssim t^{-2s}\|\zeta^t_0\Box u\|^2_s + (g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(s+1)}\|\chi^t_2 u\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Choose $\chi^t_0 = \zeta^t_s$ and $\chi^t_1 = \zeta^t_0$; we then conclude

$$\|\chi^t_0 u\|^2_s \lesssim t^{-2s}\|\chi^t_1\Box u\|^2_s + (g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(s+1)}\|\chi^t_2 u\|^2, \tag{5.18}$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{A}^{0,k} \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\Box)$.

$\Box$

Proposition 5.3. *(i)* $\|[R^m_t, \zeta^t_m]\zeta^t_{m-1}u\|^2 \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^m t^{-2j}|||\zeta^t_{m-j}u|||^2_{m-j}$

(ii) Assume that $(f\text{-}1)^k$ *holds with* $f \gg \log$*, then for any* $\epsilon \geq 0$*, there is a constant* C_ϵ *such that the error term in* (5.11) *is dominated by*

$$\epsilon Q(A^m_t u, A^m_t u) + C_\epsilon(g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(m+1)}\|\chi^t_2 u\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{m} t^{-2j}\|\zeta^t_{m-j}u\|^2_{m-j},$$

where $g := \frac{f}{\log}$ *and* g^* *is the inverse function to* g.

Proof. (i). Using formula (2.33), the proof of (i) is straightforward.
(ii). First, we show

$$\|[\bar\partial, A_t^m]u\| \le \epsilon Q(A_t^m u, A_t^m u) + C_\epsilon (g^*(t^{-1}))^{2(m+1)}\|\chi_2^t u\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m t^{-2j}\|\zeta_{m-j}^t u\|^2_{m-j}. \tag{5.19}$$

By the Jacobi identity,

$$\begin{aligned}[\bar\partial, A_t^m] =&[\bar\partial, \zeta_{m-1}^t R_t^m \zeta_{m-1}^t]\\ =&[\bar\partial, \zeta_{m-1}^t]R_t^m\zeta_{m-1}^t + \zeta_{m-1}^t[\bar\partial, R_t^m]\zeta_{m-1}^t + \zeta_{m-1}^t R_t^m[\bar\partial, \zeta_{m-1}^t].\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Since the support of the derivative of ζ_{m-1}^t is disjoint from the support of σ_m^t, the first and third terms in the second line of (5.20) are bounded by $\frac{C}{t}$ in L_2. The middle term in (5.20) is treated as follows. Let a belong to $\mathcal{S}$ and D be $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ or D_r; we have

$$[aD, R_t^m] = [a, R_t^m]D + a[D, R_t^m]. \tag{5.21}$$

Now, if $D = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$, the term first term of (5.21) is bounded by CR_t^m; if, instead, $D = D_r$, we decompose $D_r = \bar L_n + Tan$, so that $[a, R_t^m]D$ is bounded by $C\Lambda^{-1}\bar L_n R_t^m + CR_t^m$. As for the second term, we have $[D, R_t^m] = mD(\sigma_m^t)\log(\Lambda)R_t^m$; in particular, $[D, R_t^m]$ is bounded by $\frac{C}{t}\log(\Lambda)R_t^m$. Therefore,

$$\|[\bar\partial, A_t^m]u\|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{t}\|\log(\Lambda)A_t^m u\|^2 + \epsilon\|\bar L_n A_t^m u\|^2 + C_\epsilon\|\chi_2^t u\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^m t^{-2j}\|\zeta_{m-j}^t u\|^2_{m-j}. \tag{5.22}$$

To estimate the first term in (5.22), we check that

$$\frac{1}{t}\log\Lambda_\xi \le \epsilon f(\Lambda_\xi) \quad \text{on support of } \ \lambda_2\Big(g^*\big((\epsilon t)^{-1}\big)^{-1}\Lambda_\xi\Big)$$

and hence

$$\frac{1}{t}\log\Lambda_\xi \lesssim \epsilon f(\Lambda_\xi) + t^{-1}\lambda_1\Big(g^*\big((\epsilon t)^{-1}\big)^{-1}\Lambda_\xi\Big)\log\Lambda_\xi. \tag{5.23}$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{t}\|\log\Lambda A_t^m u\|^2 \le&\epsilon\|f(\Lambda)A_t^m u\|^2 + t^{-2}g^*\big((\epsilon t)^{-1}\big)^{2m}\log^2\Big(g^*\big((\epsilon t)^{-1}\big)\Big)\|\chi_2^t u\|^2\\ \le&\epsilon\|f(\Lambda)A_t^m u\|^2 + C_\epsilon g^*(t^{-1})^{2(m+1)}\|\chi_2^t u\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Since we are supposing that $(f\text{-}1)^k$ holds, we get the proof of the inequality (5.19). By a similar argument, we can estimate all error terms in (5.11) and obtain the conclusion of the proof of Theorem 5.1.

□

5.2 Kohn's proof of local regularity

In [K02], Kohn proved that superlogarithmic estimates of the system $(\bar\partial_b, \bar\partial_b^*)$ on a hypersurface M imply local regularity of the operator $\Box_b^{-1}$; and superlogarithmic estimates of the system $(\bar\partial_b, \bar\partial_b^*)$ on microlocalized forms u^+ imply local regularity of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator on the side Ω^+. The purpose of this section is to give a direct proof, without passing through the tangential system, of the local regularity of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator and the Bergman projection and of the smoothness of the Bergman kernel. Also, our argument applies to general q-pseudoconvex domains.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a bounded q-pseudoconvex domain with C^∞ boundary. Suppose that $\Box$ is invertible, modulo $\mathcal{H}^{0,k}$ for $k \geq q$, and denote by N_k its inverse over k-forms. Suppose further that superlogarithmic estimates hold in degree $k \geq q$, that is, $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimates hold for $f = \log$ and $\mathcal{M} = \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Let χ_0 and χ_1 be smooth cutoff functions supported in U with $\chi_1 \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of the support of χ_0. Then the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N_k as well as the Bergman projection P_{k-1} satisfy for any s and for any $\alpha \in H_s(\Omega)^{0,k}$ the estimates*

$$\|\chi_0 N_k \alpha\|_s^2 \lesssim \|\chi_1 \alpha\|_s^2 + \|\alpha\|^2, \tag{5.25}$$

$$\|\chi_0 \bar\partial^* N_k \alpha\|_s^2 + \|\chi_0 \bar\partial N_k \alpha\|_s^2 \lesssim \|\chi_1 \alpha\|_s^2 + \|\alpha\|^2, \tag{5.26}$$

$$\|\chi_0 P_{k-1} \alpha\|_s^2 \lesssim \|\chi_1 \alpha\|_s^2 + \|\alpha\|^2. \tag{5.27}$$

Moreover, if (z_0, w_0) is a point in $(b\Omega \times b\Omega)\setminus(\text{Diagonal})$ such that $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimates hold at both points z_0 and w_0, then the Bergman kernel $K(z,w)$ extends smoothly to $\bar\Omega \times \bar\Omega$ locally in a neighborhood of (z_0, w_0).

Proof. The first statement, about N_k, $\bar\partial^* N_k$, $\bar\partial N_k$ and P_{k-1} follows from Theorem 5.1 combined with the standard method of elliptic regularization by Kohn-Nirenberg [KN65]. As for the last statement concerning $K(z,w)$, it follows from the previous one combined with the results of Kerzmann [Ke72].

□

5.3 Catlin's proof of the necessary condition

In this section we derive geometric conditions for $b\Omega$ if the $(f\text{-}1)^k$ estimate holds. We restate and prove now the first half part of Theorem 1.14.

Theorem 5.5. *Let Ω be a pseudoconvex domain with a local defining function r at z_0 and suppose further that the $(f\text{-}1)^k$ estimate holds. Let Z be a k-dimensional* *complex analytic variety passing through* z_0 *and suppose that* $b\Omega$ *has type* $\leq F$ *along* Z *at* z_0 *in the sense that*

$$|r(z)| \lesssim F(|z - z_0|) \quad \textit{for } z \in Z \textit{ close to } z_0. \tag{5.28}$$

Then, for small δ,

$$\frac{f(\delta^{-1})}{\log(\delta^{-1})} \lesssim F^*(\delta)^{-1},$$

where F^* *is the inverse function to* F.

To prove Theorem 5.5 we have to recall the following theorem from [C83] which holds for any domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ not necessarily q-pseudoconvex nor q-pseudoconcave. The result of Catlin is proved for domains of *finite type*, that is, for $F(\delta) = \delta^m$, but it holds in full generality of F.

Theorem 5.6. *Let* Ω *be a domain in* $\mathbb{C}^n$ *with smooth boundary and assume that that there is a function* F *and a* k*-dimensional complex-analytic variety* Z *passing through* z_0 *such that* (5.28) *is satisfied for* $z \in Z$, z *close to* z_0. *Then, in any neighborhood* U *of* z_0, *there is a family* $\{Z_t, t \in T\}$ *of* k*-dimensional complex manifolds contained in* U *of diameter comparable to* t *such that*

$$\sup_{z \in Z_t} |r(z)| \lesssim F(t).$$

For the proof of Theorem 5.5 we also need the next lemma which is contained in [C83].

Lemma 5.7. *Let* Ω *be a bounded pseudoconvex domain in* $\mathbb{C}^n$. *Let* $z_0 \in b\Omega$ *and assume that* $b\Omega$ *is smooth near* z_0 *with a smooth boundary-defining function* r *normalized by* $\frac{\partial r}{\partial x_n}(z_0) > 0$. *Then there exists a neighborhood* U *of* z_0 *such that for each* $w \in U \cap \Omega$, *there is a function* G *holomorphic and* L_2 *on* Ω *with the following properties*

1. $\|G\|^2 \lesssim 1$
2. $\left|\frac{\partial^k G}{\partial z_n}(w)\right| \gtrsim |r(w)|^{-(k+\frac{1}{2})}$ *for all* $k \geq 0$.

Proof of Theorem 5.5. By Theorem 5.6, for each $t \in T$, there is a point $\gamma_t \in Z_t$, which satisfies $|r(\gamma_t)| \lesssim F(t)$ and by Lemma 5.7 there is a function $G_t \in A(\Omega) \cap L_2(\Omega)$ such that

$$\|G_t\| \leq 1$$

and

$$\left|\frac{\partial^m G_t}{\partial z_n^m}(\gamma_t)\right| \gtrsim F(t)^{-(m+\frac{1}{2})}.$$

We parametrize Z_t over $\mathbb{C}^k \times \{0\}$ by

$$z' \mapsto (z', h_t(z')).$$

Let ϕ be a cutoff function on $\mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\phi = 1$ on $[0,1)$ and $\phi = 0$ on $[2, +\infty)$. Let, for some a to be chosen later

$$\psi_t(z') = \phi\Big(\frac{8|z' - \gamma_t'|}{at}\Big),$$

where $z' = (z_1, ..., z_k)$. Choose the datum α_t as

$$\alpha_t = \psi_t(z')G_t(z)d\bar{z}_1 \wedge ... \wedge d\bar{z}_k$$

Clearly the form α_t is $\bar{\partial}$-closed and its coefficient belongs to L_2. Let v_t be the canonical solution of $\bar{\partial}$ with datum α_t, that is, $v_t = \bar{\partial}^* u_t$ where $\Box u_t = \alpha_t$. We have

$$\bar{\partial} v_t = \alpha_t.$$

Define the action of $\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}$ over a form by applying $\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}$ to each coefficient. Since $\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}$ and $\bar{\partial}$ commute, we then have

$$\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}\alpha_t = \frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}\bar{\partial} v_t = \bar{\partial}\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m} v_t. \tag{5.29}$$

On each polydisc $B_{at}^k(\gamma_t')$ of center γ_t' and radius at, we put the standard Euclidean metric. This gives rise to an inner product on differential forms supported in $B_{at}^k(\gamma_t')$ that we denote by

$$\int_{B_{at}^k(\gamma_t')} \langle , \rangle dV, \tag{5.30}$$

where dV is the volume element in $\mathbb{C}^k$.
We also define a k-form w_t by

$$w_t = \phi(\frac{8|z' - \gamma_t'|}{3at})d\bar{z}_1 \wedge ... \wedge d\bar{z}_k.$$

We use the notation

$$\mathcal{K}_t^m = \int_{B_{at}^k(\gamma_t')} \langle \frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}\alpha_t(z', h_t(z')), w_t\rangle dV. \tag{5.31}$$

We use polar coordinates to evaluate (5.31) and get

$$\mathcal{K}_t^m = 2^k \int_0^{ta/4} \phi(\frac{8s}{ta})\phi(\frac{8s}{3ta}) \int_{|w'|=1} \frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}\psi_t G_t(w', h_t(\gamma_t' + sw'))s^{2k-1} dS ds. \tag{5.32}$$

Since $\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}G_t(z', h_t(z'))$ is holomorphic, it satisfies the Mean Value Equality. Thus

$$\mathcal{K}_t^m = 2^k\Big(\int_0^{ta/4}\chi(\frac{8s}{ta})s^{2k-1}ds\Big)\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}\psi_t G_t(w', h_t(\gamma_t'+sw'))\int_{|w'|=1}dS.$$

Recalling that $\psi_t G_t(w', h_t(\gamma_t'+sw')) = G_t(\gamma_t)$, then, on account of (5.31), we have a lower bound for $\mathcal{K}_t^m$

$$\mathcal{K}_t^m \gtrsim t^{2k}F(t)^{-(m+\frac{1}{2})}. \tag{5.33}$$

On the other hand, from (5.29) we obtain

$$\mathcal{K}_t^m = \int_{B_{at}^k(\gamma_t')}\langle\bar\partial\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}v_t(h_t), w_t\rangle dV = \int_{B_{at}^k(\gamma_t')}\langle\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}v_t(h_t), \vartheta w_t\rangle dV$$

where ϑ is the adjoint of $\bar\partial$ with respect to the inner product (5.30). We define a set

$$S_t = \{z'\in\mathbb{C}^k : \frac{3at}{8}\le|z'-\gamma_t'|\lesssim\frac{6at}{8}\}.$$

Since ϑw_t is supported in S_t and $|\vartheta w_t|\lesssim t^{-1}$, then

$$\mathcal{K}_t^m \lesssim t^{2k-1}\sup_{S_t}|\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}v_t(h_t)| \lesssim t^{2k-1}\sup_{h_t(S_t)}|\frac{\partial^m}{\partial z_n^m}\bar\partial^* u_t| \lesssim t^{2k-1}\sup_{h_t(S_t)}|\underset{|\beta|=m+1}{D^\beta}u_t|. \tag{5.34}$$

Before completing the proof of Theorem 5.5, we need the proposition which follows which is dedicated to state an upper bound for $\mathcal{K}_t^m$.

Proposition 5.8.

$$\sup_{h_t(S_t)}|\underset{|\beta|=m+1}{D^\beta}u_t| \lesssim g^*(t^{-1})^{m+n+3}. \tag{5.35}$$

Proof. Since the set S_t has diameter $O(at)$ and the function h_t satisfies $|dh_t(z')|\le C$ for $z'\in B_{at}^k(\gamma_t')$, then the set $h_t(S_t)$ has diameter of size $O(at)$. Moreover, by construction, there exists a constant c such that

$$\inf\{|z_1-z_2| : z_1\in\text{supp}\alpha_t,\quad z_2\in(\text{id}\times h_t)(S_t)\} > 2ct.$$

Therefore, we may choose χ_0 and χ_1 such that if we set $\chi_k^t(z)=\chi_k(\frac{z}{ct})$ for $k=0,1$, we have the properties

(1) $\quad\chi_0^t = 1\quad$ on $\quad(\text{id}\times h_t)(S_t)$

(2) $\quad\alpha_t = 0\quad$ on $\quad\text{supp}\chi_1^t$.

Hence

$$\sup_{(\mathrm{id}\times h_t)(S_t)} |\underset{|\beta|=m+1}{D^\beta} u_t| \lesssim \sup_{\Omega\cap Z_t} |\underset{|\beta|=m+1}{D^\beta} \chi_0^t u_t| \lesssim \|\chi_0^t u_t\|_{m+n+1}, \tag{5.36}$$

where the last inequality follows from Sobolev Lemma since $\chi_0^t u_t$ is smooth by Theorem 5.4. We use now Theorem 5.1 and observe that $\chi_1^t \Box u_t = 0$ (by property 2 of χ_1^t). It follows

$$\|\chi_0^t u_t\|^2_{m+n+1} \lesssim g^*(t^{-1})^{2(m+n+2)} \|u_t\|^2.$$

Since Ω is bounded pseudoconvex, then

$$\|u_t\|^2 \lesssim \|\Box u_t\|^2 = \|\alpha_t\|^2 \lesssim 1.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 5.8.

□

End of Proof of Theorem 5.5. We return to the proof of Theorem 5.5. Combining (5.33) with (5.34) and (5.35), we get the upper estimate

$$t^{2k} F(t)^{-(m+\frac{1}{2})} \leq C t^{2k-1} g^*(t^{-1})^{m+n+2}.$$

It follows

$$t^{\frac{1}{m}} F(t)^{-1-\frac{1}{2m}} \leq C^{\frac{1}{m}} g^*(t^{-1})^{1+\frac{n+2}{m}}.$$

Since this holds for all positive m, we may take the limit as $m \to \infty$ and end up with

$$F(t)^{-1} \leq g^*(t^{-1}).$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 5.5.

□

5.4 Mc Neal's proof of lower bounds for the Bergman metric

Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Denote $H(\Omega)$ by the space of holomorphic functions on Ω and set $A^2(\Omega) = H(\Omega) \cap L^2(\Omega)$. The space $A^2(\Omega)$ is a Hilbert space under the inner product

$$(\varphi, \psi) = \int_\Omega \varphi \bar{\psi} dV.$$

For each point $a \in \Omega$, the evaluation map

$$e_a : A^2(\Omega) \ni \varphi \mapsto \varphi(a) \in \mathbb{C}$$

is a bounded linear functional on $A^2(\Omega)$. Therefore, by the Riesz Representation Theorem, there is a unique element in $A^2(\Omega)$, that we denote by $K_\Omega(\cdot, a)$, such that

$$\varphi(a) = e_a(\varphi) = (\varphi, K(\cdot, a)) = \int \varphi(\zeta)\overline{K(\zeta, a)}dV(\zeta) \tag{5.37}$$

for all $\varphi \in A^2(\Omega)$. The function

$$K_\Omega : \Omega \times \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$$

obtained in this way is called the *Bergman kernel* for Ω.

For the choice $\varphi = K_\Omega(\cdot, z)$ and $a = \zeta \in \Omega$, (5.37) yields the proof of the following fundamental symmetry property of K.

Lemma 5.9. *The Bergman kernel K satisfies*

$$K(\zeta, z) = \overline{K(z, \zeta)} \qquad \textit{for all } \zeta, z \in \Omega. \tag{5.38}$$

Notice that by (5.38), we can rewrite (5.37) in the form

$$\varphi(z) = \int \varphi(\zeta)K(z, \zeta)dV(\zeta) \quad \text{for all } \varphi \in A^2(\Omega) \text{ and } z \in \Omega. \tag{5.39}$$

Since $A^2(\Omega)$ is a closed subspace of $L_2(\Omega)$, there is an orthogonal projection operator $P := P_\Omega$

$$P : L^2(\Omega) \to A^2(\Omega). \tag{5.40}$$

This operator is usually called the *Bergman projection.* The Schwartz kernel theorem implies that the Bergman projection is represented by integration against the Bergman kernel function, that is,

$$P\varphi(z) = \int \varphi(\zeta)K(z, \zeta)dV(\zeta) \text{ for all } \varphi \in L_2(\Omega) \text{ and } z \in \Omega. \tag{5.41}$$

The relation between the Bergman projection P and the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N, is expressed by Kohn's formula

$$P = I - \bar\partial^* N \bar\partial. \tag{5.42}$$

From the Bergman kernel K_Ω, one obtains a very interesting metric on $\mathbb{C}T(\Omega)$. Let

$$g_{ij}(z) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_i \partial \bar{z}_j} \log K(z,z) \tag{5.43}$$

and, for $X = \sum_{i=j}^n a_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}$, define

$$B_\Omega(z,X) = \Big(\sum_{ij=1}^n g_{ij} a_i \bar{a}_j\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{5.44}$$

This differential metric, the Bergman metric, is primarily interesting because of its holomorphic invariance properties. If we derive the set-theoretic metric on Ω from B_Ω in the standard way, then, with respect to this metric, distances are preserved under a biholomorphic transformation on Ω.

One can obtain the value of the Bergman kernel function on the diagonal of $\Omega \times \Omega$ and the length of tangent vector X in the Bergman metric by solving the following extreme value problems :

$$\begin{aligned} K_\Omega(z,z) =& \inf\{\|\varphi\|^2 : \varphi \in H(\Omega), \varphi(z) = 1\}^{-1} \\ =& \sup\{|\varphi(z)|^2 : \varphi \in H(\Omega), \|\varphi\| \le 1\} \end{aligned} \tag{5.45}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B_\Omega(z,X) =& \frac{\inf\{\|\varphi\| : \varphi \in H(\Omega), \varphi(z) = 0, X\varphi(z) = 1\}^{-1}}{\sqrt{K_\Omega(z,z)}} \\ =& \frac{\sup\{|X\varphi(z)| : \varphi \in H(\Omega), \varphi(z) = 0, \|\varphi\| \le 1\}}{\sqrt{K_\Omega(z,z)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.46}$$

The purpose of this section is to study the boundary behavior of $B_\Omega(z,X)$ for z near a point $z_0 \in b\Omega$, when a $(f\text{-}1)^1$ estimate for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem holds. In this section, we show the second part of Theorem 1.14, that is,

Theorem 5.10. *Let $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be pseudoconvex with a smooth boundary in a neighborhood U of z_0. Suppose that $(f\text{-}1)^1$ holds in U with $f \gg \log$. Given a constant $\eta > 0$, there exists $U' \subset U$, so that for all $z \in U' \cap \Omega$ and any $X \in T^{1,0}_z\mathbb{C}^n$,*

$$B_\Omega(z,X) \underset{\sim}{>} g(\delta(z)^{-1+\eta})|X|$$

where $\delta(z)$ is the distance of z to $b\Omega$ and $g = \frac{f}{\log}$.

Theorem 5.10 is a new version of Theorem 1 by McNeal [McN92]. In Theorem 5.10, we treat the case in which the domain has non-finite type. For the proof of Theorem 5.10, we first use the classical results about locally comparable properties of Bergman kernel and Bergman metric, that is,

Proposition 5.11. *Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be bounded pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that a portion of $b\Omega_1$ and $b\Omega_2$ coincide. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\Omega_1}(z,z) &\cong K_{\Omega_2}(z,z); &(5.47)\\ B_{\Omega_1}(z,X) &\cong B_{\Omega_2}(z,X), &(5.48)\end{aligned}$$

for z near the coincidental portion of the two boundaries and $X \in T^{1,0}_z(\mathbb{C}^n)$.

(cf. [McN92] or [DFH84].)

To apply Proposition 5.11, we construct a smooth pseudoconvex domain $\tilde{\Omega}$, contained in Ω, that shares a piece of its boundary with $b\Omega$ near z_0. The crucial property that $\tilde{\Omega}$ has, for our purpose, is the exact, global regularity of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator. In fact, one can show that

Proposition 5.12. *Let Ω be a smooth, bounded, pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $z_0 \in b\Omega$. Then, there exist a neighborhood U of z_0 and a smooth, bounded, pseudoconvex domain $\tilde{\Omega}$ satisfying the following properties:*

(i) $\tilde{\Omega} \subset \Omega \cap U$,

(ii) $b\tilde{\Omega} \cap b\Omega$ *contains a neighborhood of* z_0 *in* $b\Omega$,

(iii) all points in $b\tilde{\Omega} \setminus b\Omega$ *are points of strong pseudoconvexity.*

A proof of Proposition 5.12 can be found in [McN92]. Let $z_0 \in b\Omega$ such that an $(f\text{-}1)^1$ estimate holds in a neighborhood of z_0. By Proposition 5.12 one can get that the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N of $\tilde{\Omega}$ is exactly, globally regular and that the $(f\text{-}1)^1$ estimate holds in a neighborhood of z_0. Therefore, Theorem 5.10 is an immediate consequence of Proposition 5.11, 5.12 and the following

Theorem 5.13. *Let Ω be a smooth, bounded, pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ which has an exactly, globally regular $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator. Let $z_0 \in b\Omega$ and U be a neighborhood of z_0. Suppose that $(f\text{-}1)^1$ holds in U with $f \gg \log$. Given a constant $\eta > 0$, there exists $U' \subset U$, so that for all $z \in U' \cap \Omega$ and any $X \in T^{1,0}_z\mathbb{C}^n$,*

$$B_\Omega(z,X) \underset{\sim}{>} g(\delta(z)^{-1+\eta})|X|,$$

where $\delta(z)$ is the distance of $z \in b\Omega$ to $g = \frac{f}{\log}$.

Before giving the proof of Theorem 5.13, we need some preliminaries.

Let ψ be the cutoff functions such that

$$\psi(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } z \in B(z_0, 1), \\ 1 & \text{if } z \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus B(z_0, 2), \end{cases}$$

where $B(z_0, a)$ is the ball in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with center z_0 and radius a. We also set $\psi^t = \psi(\frac{z}{t})$. To prove Theorem 5.13, we also need the following

Proposition 5.14. *Suppose that Ω satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 5.13. Let ψ^t be defined as above. Then if $\alpha \in C_c^\infty(B(z_0, \frac{t}{8}) \cap \bar{\Omega})^1$, for any nonnegative integer s_1, s_2, we have*

$$\|\psi^t N\alpha\|_{s_1}^2 \lesssim g^*(t^{-1})^{2(s_1+s_2+4)} \|\alpha\|_{-s_2}^2. \tag{5.49}$$

Proof. We choose a triple of cutoff functions χ_0^t, χ_1^t and χ_2^t in Theorem 5.1, such that $\chi_0^t \equiv 1$ on a neighborhood of the support of the derivative of ψ^t and supp $\chi_2^t \subset B(z_0, 3t) \setminus B(z_0, \frac{t}{2})$; hence $\chi_1^t \alpha = 0$. We notice that for t sufficiently small, supp$\chi_j^t \subset\subset U$ for $j = 0, 1, 2$, so that we can apply Theorem 5.1 to this triple of cutoff functions. Using the global regularity estimate and Theorem 5.1 for an arbitrary 1-form $u \in \mathcal{A}^{0,1} \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\Box)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi^t u\|_{s_1}^2 \lesssim & \|\Box \psi^t u\|_{s_1}^2 \\ \lesssim & \|\psi^t \Box u\|_{s_1}^2 + \|[\Box, \psi^t] u\|_{s_1}^2 \\ \lesssim & \|\psi^t \Box u\|_{s_1}^2 + t^{-2} \|\chi_0^t u\|_{s_1+1}^2 + t^{-4} \|\chi_0^t u\|_{s_1}^2 \\ \lesssim & \|\psi^t \Box u\|_{s_1}^2 + t^{-2(s_1+2)} \|\chi_1^t \Box u\|_{s_1+1}^2 + g^*(t^{-1})^{2(s_1+3)} \|\chi_2^t u\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.50}$$

Recall that we are supposing that the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator is globally regular. If $\alpha \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})^1$, then $N\alpha \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})^1 \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\Box)$. Substituting $u = N\alpha$ in (5.50) for $\alpha \in C_c^\infty(B(z_0, \frac{t}{8}) \cap \bar{\Omega})^1$, we obtain

$$\|\psi^t N\alpha\|_{s_1}^2 \lesssim g^*(t^{-1})^{2(s_1+3)} \|\chi_2^t N\alpha\|^2. \tag{5.51}$$

However,

$$\|\chi_2^t N\alpha\| = \sup\{|(\chi_2^t N\alpha, \beta)| : \|\beta\| \leq 1\},$$

and the self-adjointness of N and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} |(\chi_2^t N\alpha, \beta)| = & |(\alpha, N\chi_2^t \beta)| \\ = & |(\alpha, \tilde{\chi}_0^t N \chi_2^t \beta)| \\ \lesssim & \|\alpha\|_{-s_2} \|\tilde{\chi}_0^t N \chi_2^t \beta\|_{s_2}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.52}$$

where $\tilde\chi_0^t$ is a cutoff function such that $\tilde\chi_0^t \equiv 1$ on supp α. Let $\tilde\chi_1^t$ be a cutoff function such that $\tilde\chi_1^t = 1$ on supp $\tilde\chi_0^t$ and supp $\tilde\chi_1^t \subset\subset B(z_0, \frac{t}{4})$. Hence supp $\tilde\chi_1^t \cap$supp $\chi_2^t = \emptyset$. Let $\tilde\chi_2^t$ be a cutoff function such that $\tilde\chi_2^t = 1$ on supp $\tilde\chi_1^t$. Using again Theorem 5.1 for the triple of cutoff functions $\tilde\chi_0^t, \tilde\chi_1^t$ and χ_2^t, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde\chi_0^t N\chi_2^t\beta\|^2_{s_2} \lesssim & t^{-2s_2}\|\tilde\chi_1^t\chi_2^t\beta\|^2_{s_2} + g^*(t^{-1})^{2(s_2+1)}\|\tilde\chi_2^t N\chi_2^t\beta\|^2 \\ \lesssim & g^*(t^{-1})^{2(s_2+1)}\|\tilde\chi_2^t N\chi_2^t\beta\|^2 \\ \lesssim & g^*(t^{-1})^{2(s_2+1)}\|\beta\|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{5.53}$$

Taking supremum over all $\|\beta\| \leq 1$, we get (5.49).

□

Proof of Theorem 5.13. Let $\eta = (\eta_1, ..., \eta_n)$ the complex coordinates near z_0. L_2 norms and derivatives are computed with respect to the η variables. For $z \in U'$, we can choose η such that $X(z) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\eta_1}$. We may also suppose that $\frac{\partial r}{\partial x_n}(z) > 0$ where $x_n + iy_n = \eta_n$. If $z \in U'$ and $z \notin b\Omega$, we define

$$h_z(\eta) = \frac{K_\Omega(\eta, z)}{\sqrt{K_\Omega(z,z)}};$$

hence $\|h_z\| = 1$ and $\frac{|h_z(z)|}{\sqrt{K_\Omega(z,z)}} = 1$. We set

$$\gamma_z(\eta) = R(z)(\eta_1 - z_1)h_z(\eta)$$

where $R(z)$ will be chosen later. It is an obvious fact that $\gamma_z \in H(\Omega)$ and $\gamma_z(z) = 0$. We show that for a specified choice of $R(z)$, the norm $\|\gamma_z\| \leq 1$. Then by (5.46), we get

$$B_\Omega(z, X) \geq \frac{|X\gamma_z(z)|}{\sqrt{K_\Omega(z,z)}} = \frac{|R(z)h_z(z)|}{\sqrt{K_\Omega(z,z)}} = |R(z)|. \tag{5.54}$$

In all what follows, z is fixed in U'. Let $t = \theta(\delta(z))$, for a function θ to be chosen later. For ψ^t, as in Proposition 5.14, we define $\psi_z^t(\eta) = \psi^t(\eta - z)$. We write

$$\gamma_z(\eta) = \psi_z^t(\eta)\gamma_z(\eta) + (1 - \psi_z^t(\eta))\gamma_z(\eta). \tag{5.55}$$

A simple estimation of the second term gives

$$\|(1 - \psi_z^t)\gamma_z\| \lesssim |R(z)|t = |R(z)|\theta(\delta(z)). \tag{5.56}$$

In order to estimate the first term in right hand side of (5.55), we rewrite this term as

$$\psi_z^t(\eta)\gamma_z(\eta) = \psi_z^t(\eta)R(z)(\eta_1 - z_1)\frac{D^m\bar G(z)}{D^m\bar G(z)}h_z(\eta), \tag{5.57}$$

where G is the holomorphic function defined in Lemma 5.7, and D^m denote the operator $\frac{\partial^m}{\partial \bar\eta_n^m}$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that by (5.45) and Lemma 5.7 for $m = 0$, we get

$$K_\Omega(z,z) \gtrsim |G(z)|^2 \gtrsim \delta^{-1}(z). \tag{5.58}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi_z^t\gamma_z\| \le & |R(z)| \cdot \mathrm{diam}\Omega \cdot \frac{1}{|D^m\bar G(x)|} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{K_\Omega(z,z)}} \cdot \|\psi_z^t K_\Omega(\cdot,z)D^m\bar G(z)\| \\ \lesssim & |R(z)|\delta^{m+1}\|\psi_z^t K_\Omega(\cdot,z)D^m\bar G(z)\|.\end{aligned} \tag{5.59}$$

Now, we consider the norm in last line of (5.59). Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty(B(0,1))$ be a nonnegative radial function with $\int \phi = 1$. If $z \in U'$, set

$$\phi_z^t(\zeta) = \Big(\frac{t}{10}\Big)^{-2n}\phi\Big(\frac{\zeta - z}{t/10}\Big).$$

From the mean value theorem for antiholomorphic functions, (5.41) and (5.42), we have

$$\begin{aligned}K_\Omega(\zeta,z)D^m\bar G(z) = & \int_\Omega K(\zeta,w)\big(D^m\bar G(w)\big)\phi_z^t(w)dw \\ = & P\Big(\big(D^m\bar G(\zeta)\big)\phi_z^t(\zeta)\Big) \\ = & \big(D^m\bar G(\zeta)\big)\phi_z^t(\zeta) - \bar\partial^* N\bar\partial\Big(\big(D^m\bar G(\zeta)\big)\phi_z^t(\zeta)\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.60}$$

Notice that the supports of ψ_0^t and ϕ_z^t are disjoint, and that supp $\bar\partial\Big(\big(D^m\bar G(\zeta)\big)\phi_z^t(\zeta)\Big)$ is contained in $B(z, \frac{t}{8})$ for all $z \in U'$. We may therefore apply Proposition 5.14 for z_0 replaced by z, with $s_1 = 1$, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\psi_z^t K_\Omega(\cdot,z)D^m\bar G(z)\|^2 = & \|\psi_z^t\bar\partial^* N\bar\partial\Big(\big(D^m\bar G\big)\phi_z^t\Big)\|^2 \\ \lesssim & \|\psi_z^t N\bar\partial\Big(\big(D^m\bar G\big)\phi_z^t\Big)\|_1^2 + \|[\psi_z^t,\bar\partial^*]N\bar\partial\Big(\big(D^m\bar G\big)\phi_z^t\Big)\|^2 \\ \lesssim & g^*(t^{-1})^{2(1+s_2)}\|\bar\partial\Big(\big(D^m\bar G\big)\phi_z^t\Big)\|_{-s_2}^2 \\ \lesssim & g^*(t^{-1})^{2(2+s_2)}\|\big(D^m\bar G\big)\phi_z^t\|_{-s_2+1}^2 \\ \lesssim & g^*(t^{-1})^{2(2+s_2)}\|D^m\bar G\|_{-m}\|\phi_z^t\|_{-s_2+m+1},\end{aligned} \tag{5.61}$$

where the last inequality follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. We notice that $\|D^m\bar G\|_{-m} \lesssim \|\bar G\| \le 1$ and, if $s_2 - m - 1 > n$, the Sobolev's lemma implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\phi_z^t\|^2_{-s_2+m+1} =& \sup\{(|(\phi_z^t,h)| : h\in C_c^\infty, \|h\|_{s_2-m-1}\le 1\}\\ \lesssim&\|\phi_z^t\| \\ =&1.\end{aligned} \tag{5.62}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\|\psi_z^t K_\Omega(\cdot,z)D^m\bar{G}(z)\|^2 \lesssim g^*(\theta(\delta(z))^{-1})^{2(m+n+4)}. \tag{5.63}$$

Combining (5.59) and (5.63), we obtain

$$\|\psi_z^t\gamma_z\| \lesssim|R(z)|\delta(z)^{m+1}g^*(\theta(\delta(z))^{-1})^{m+n+4}. \tag{5.64}$$

Choose $\theta = g(\delta^{-1+\eta})^{-1}$, so that $g^*(\theta(\delta)^{-1}) = \delta^{-1+\eta}$ for $\eta > 0$. It follows

$$\|\psi_z^t\gamma_z\| \lesssim|R(z)|\delta(z)^{\eta m-(1-\eta)n-3+4\eta}. \tag{5.65}$$

In order that the right-hand side of (5.56) be $\lesssim 1$, we must have $|R(z)| \lesssim \theta(z)^{-1}$. Letting $R(z) = \theta(z)^{-1}$ in formula (5.65), then forces

$$g(\delta^{-1+\eta})\delta(z)^{\eta m-(1-\eta)n-3+4\eta} \lesssim 1 \tag{5.66}$$

in order that $\|\psi_0^t\gamma_z\| \lesssim 1$. Since $g(\delta^{-1+\eta}) = \frac{f}{\log}(\delta^{-1+\eta}) \lesssim \delta^{-1}$, (5.66) follows by letting $m \to +\infty$. We thus conclude that $\|\gamma_z\| \lesssim 1$, and then from (5.54) we get

$$B_\Omega(z,X) \gtrsim |R(z)| = g(\delta^{-1+\eta}).$$

Theorem 5.13 is proved.

□

5.5 How the Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ follows from the $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M})^k$ estimate

It is classical that ϵ-subelliptic estimates imply Property $(\tilde{f}\text{-}1\text{-}P)^k$ with $\tilde{f}(\delta^{-1}) = \delta^{-\tilde{\epsilon}}$ for a new $\tilde{\epsilon} < \epsilon$. This is highly non-trivial and requires a big amount of Catlin's theory. First one proves that ϵ-subelliptic estimates imply D'Angelo's finite type D according to our discussion in Section 6.4.3. Here the link between ϵ and D is accurate and one has $D \le \frac{1}{\epsilon}$. Next, according to [C87], we have the converse. The proof goes through the construction of a family of weights, that is, Property $(\tilde{f}\text{-}1\text{-}P)^k$. Combining with the former step, we get that ϵ-subelliptic estimates imply Property $(\tilde{f}\text{-}1\text{-}P)^k$; however, the relation of $\tilde{\epsilon}$ with D and, hence with the initial ϵ, is very rough. This makes very interesting to have at disposal a direct proof of the implication of Property $(\tilde{f}\text{-}1\text{-}P)^k$ from ϵ-subelliptic estimates. In this implication, we also search for a better accuracy about indices. The possible existence of a direct implication was a question raised also by Straube in Vienna in December 2009. Here is the answer.

Theorem 5.15. *Let $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a pseudoconvex domain with a smooth boundary in a neighborhood U of $z_0 \in b\Omega$. Suppose that $(f\text{-}1)^1$ holds in U with $f \gg \log$. Then, given a constant $\eta > 0$, there exists $U' \subset U$, such that Property $(\tilde{f}\text{-}1\text{-}P)^1$ holds in U' with $\tilde{f}(\delta^{-1}) = \frac{f}{\log^{3/2+\eta}}(\delta^{-1+\eta})$.*

Proof. The notations $K_\Omega(z,z,\ \delta(z),\ U'$ and η are the same as in Theorem 5.10. Define

$$\phi(z) = \frac{\log K_\Omega(z,z)}{\big(\log(\delta^{-1}(z))\big)^{1+2\eta}} - \frac{1}{\big(\log(\delta^{-1}(z))\big)^{\eta}} \tag{5.67}$$

for $z \in U'$. Recall that $K_\Omega(z,z) \underset{\sim}{>} \delta^{-1}(z)$ by (5.58) whereas the opposite estimate is obvious because Ω contains an osculating ball at any boundary point. Thus $\phi(z) \to 0$ as $\delta(z) \to 0$ (and in particular, ϕ is bounded). Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\bar\partial\phi(z)(u^\tau) =& \frac{\partial\bar\partial \log K_\Omega(z,z)(u^\tau)}{\big(\log(\delta^{-1}(z))\big)^{1+2\eta}} + (1+2\eta)\frac{\log K_\Omega(z,z)\cdot\partial\bar\partial\delta(z)(u^\tau)}{\delta(z)\big(\log(\delta^{-1}(z))\big)^{2+\eta}}\\ &- \eta\frac{\partial\bar\partial\delta(z)(u^\tau)}{\delta(z)\big(\log(\delta^{-1}(z))\big)^{1+\eta}}\\ =& \frac{\partial\bar\partial \log K_\Omega(z,z)(u^\tau)}{\big(\log(\delta^{-1}(z))\big)^{1+2\eta}} + \frac{\partial\bar\partial\delta(z)(u^\tau)}{\delta(z)\big(\log(\delta^{-1}(z))\big)^{1+\eta}}\times\\ &\times\left((1+2\eta)\frac{\log K_\Omega(z,z)}{\log\delta^{-1}(z)} - \eta\big(\log\delta^{-1}(z)\big)^{\eta}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{5.68}$$

Here, the last line between brackets is negative when z approaches $b\Omega$ because its first term stays bounded whereas the second diverges to $-\infty$. Since Ω is pseudoconvex at z_0, then $\partial\bar\partial\delta(z)(u^\tau) \le 0$. Combining with Theorem 5.10, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\partial\bar\partial\phi(z)(u^\tau) \ge& \frac{B_\Omega(z,u^\tau)^2}{\log(\delta^{-1}(z))^{1+2\eta}}\\ \underset{\sim}{>}& \frac{(f(\delta^{-1+\eta}(z)))^2}{(\log\delta^{-1+\eta}(z))^2\cdot\log(\delta^{-1}(z))^{1+2\eta}}|u^\tau|^2\\ =& \left(\frac{f}{\log^{\frac{3}{2}+\eta}}\Big(\delta^{-1+\eta}(z)\Big)\right)^2|u^\tau|^2\end{aligned} \tag{5.69}$$

for all z near $b\Omega$. The inequality (5.69) implies the proof of the theorem.

$\square$

Corollary 5.16. *Let $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a pseudoconvex domain with a smooth boundary in a neighborhood of $z_0 \in b\Omega$. Suppose that ϵ-subelliptic estimate holds in a neighborhood of z_0. Then, Property $(f\text{-}1\text{-}P)^1$ also holds with $f(\delta^{-1}) = \delta^{-\epsilon+\eta}$ for any $\eta > 0$.*

Chapter 6

Global regularity

6.1 Compactness estimate and global regularity

In this section, we outline the proof of the fact that a compactness estimate implies global regularity.

A global compactness estimate is defined as follows. For every positive number M and for any $u \in C^\infty(\Omega)^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$, we have

$$M\|u\|^2 \lesssim Q(u,u) + C_M\|u\|^2_{-1}. \tag{6.1}$$

It is well-known that a compactness estimate implies global regularity. The idea of the proof is very simple. In order to prove global regularity, it suffices to prove

$$\|u\|_s \lesssim \|\Box u\|_s, \tag{6.2}$$

for any $u \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\Box)$ and for any integer s. In fact, by elliptic regularization, (6.2) passes from C^∞- to H_s-forms. When (6.2) is satisfied for any s, we say that N_k, the inverse to $\Box$ on k-forms, is *exactly regular*. We start by remarking that, since the operator $\Box$ is non-characteristic with respect to the boundary, then

$$\|u\|^2_s \lesssim \|\Box u\|^2_{s-2} + ||\Lambda^{s-1}Du||^2, \tag{6.3}$$

where D is any differential operator of order 1 and Λ^{s-1} is the tangential differential operator of order $s-1$. By Lemma 3.10, the estimate (6.1) implies that

$$M\|D\Lambda^{-1}u\|^2 \leq Q(u,u) + C_M\|u\|^2_{-1}. \tag{6.4}$$

Here D stands for D_r or Λ and the conclusion follows from the non-characteristicity of D_r.

We now estimate the last term of (6.3); we have

$$\begin{aligned} M\|\Lambda^{s-1}Du\|^2 \lesssim& M\|D\Lambda^{-1}\Lambda^s u\|^2 + M\|u\|^2_{s-1} \\ \le& Q(\Lambda^s u, \Lambda^s u) + C_M\|u\|^2_{s-1} \\ \lesssim& (\Lambda^s \Box u, \Lambda^s u) + \|[\bar\partial, \Lambda^s]u\|^2 + \|[\bar\partial, \Lambda^s]u\|^2 \\ &+ \|[\bar\partial^*, [\bar\partial, \Lambda^s]u\|^2 + \|[\bar\partial, [\bar\partial^*, \Lambda^s]u\|^2 + C_M\|u\|^2_{s-1} \\ \lesssim& \|\Lambda^s\Box u\|^2 + \|\Lambda^{s-1}Du\|^2 + \|\Lambda^{s-2}D^2u\|^2 + C_M\|u\|^2_{s-1} \\ \lesssim& \|\Box u\|^2_s + \|\Lambda^{s-1}Du\|^2 + C_M\|u\|^2_{s-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

where the second inequality follows from (6.4). Now, the term $\|\Lambda^{s-1}Du\|^2$ can be absorbed in the left-hand side for M sufficiently large. By induction, we obtain the estimate (6.2).

In Chapter 1, we have introduced a local compactness estimate in a neighborhood U of $z_0 \in b\Omega$ as

$$M\|u\|^2 \lesssim Q(u, u) + C_M\|u\|^2_{-1} \tag{6.6}$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \Omega)^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$. The following lemma yields a global estimate from a local estimate.

Lemma 6.1. *Let Ω be a bounded domain. Assume that the estimate* (6.6) *holds at any boundary point. Then* (6.1) *also holds.*

Proof. Let $\{\zeta_j\}_{j=0}^N$ be a partition of the unity such that $\zeta_0 \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, $\zeta_j \in C_c^\infty(U_j)$, $j = 1, ..., N$ and

$$\sum_{j=0}^N \zeta_j^2 = 1 \qquad \text{on } \bar\Omega,$$

where $\{U_j\}_{j=1,...,N}$ is a covering of $b\Omega$.

For $u \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$, we wish to show (6.1). From the interior elliptic regularity of Q we have

$$\|\zeta_0 u\|_1^2 \lesssim Q(\zeta_0 u, \zeta_0 u).$$

On the other hand, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$M\|\zeta_0 u\|^2 \lesssim \|\zeta_0 u\|_1^2 + C_M\|\zeta_0 u\|^2_{-1}.$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} M\|\zeta_0 u\|^2 \lesssim& Q(\zeta_0 u, \zeta_0 u) + C_M\|\zeta_0 u\|^2_{-1} \\ \lesssim& Q(u, u) + C_M\|u\|^2_{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

Similarly, for $j = 1, ..., N$, using the hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M\|\zeta_j u\|^2 \lesssim & Q(\zeta_j u, \zeta_j u) + C_M\|\zeta_j u\|^2_{-1} \\ \lesssim & Q(u, u) + C_M\|u\|^2_{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

Summing up over j, we get the proof of the lemma.

$\square$

We have thus proved that local compactness estimate over a covering of $b\Omega$ implies global compactness. In turn, this latter yields (6.2) and hence global regularity. We collect in a single statement the conclusions of this section.

Theorem 6.2. *1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a smoothly bounded q-pseudoconvex (resp. q-pseudoconcave) domain at any boundary point. Assume that a compactness estimate holds on $(0, k)$-forms with $q \leq k \leq n-1$ (resp. $1 \leq k \leq q$) in a neighborhood of any boundary point . Then the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N_k on $(0, k)$-forms is exactly, globally regular.*

2. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, $n \geq 3$, be a smooth, bounded annulus defined by $\Omega = \Omega_1 \setminus \Omega_2$ where $\bar\Omega_2 \subset \Omega_1$ and Ω_1 is p-pseudoconvex and Ω_2 is $(n-q-1)$-pseudoconvex. Assume that a compactness estimate holds on $(0, k)$-forms with $p \leq k \leq q$ in a neighborhood of any boundary point. Then the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N_k on $(0, k)$-forms, $p \leq k \leq q$, is exactly, globally regular.

3. Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, $n \geq 3$, be a C^∞, compact, q-pseudoconvex hypersurface. Assume that a compactness estimate holds on $(0, k)$-forms with $q \leq k \leq n-1-q$ in a neighborhood of any point. Then the Green operator G_k ($G_k := \Box_b^{-1}$) on $(0, k)$-form is exactly, globally regular.

6.2 Failure of compactness estimate in presence of global regularity

Is compactness estimate necessary for global regularity? Answer is no. We start from the following statement about failure of compactness estimate.

Proposition 6.3. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded pseudoconvex domain of $\mathbb{C}^n$ with a "$n-1$-Reinhardt flat" piece of boundary. This means that, in some choice of coordinates*

$$b\Omega \supset b\mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}^{n-1}_\epsilon,$$

where $\mathbb{D}$ is the unit polydisc in $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbb{D}^{n-1}_\epsilon$ the ϵ-polydisc in $\mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. Then, compactness of N_k does not hold.

Remark 6.4. This result generalizes the one by Krantz in [Kr88] and is close to the further development contained in [BS99]. In the original statement, Reinhardt domains having a flat portion of the boundary, are considered. Here, it is not required that the domain is fully Reinhardt but, we still ask for a flat Reinhardt portion of the boundary.

Proof of Proposition 6.3. We prove the proposition for the case $n = 2$ and $k = 1$, since the general proof is identical. Let $\psi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy $\psi(t) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } t \leq \frac{1}{4} \\ 0 \text{ if } t > \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}$ For $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, set

$$u_m(z_1, z_2) = \sqrt{2(m+1)}\, z_1^m \psi(|z_2|^2) d\bar{z}_2.$$

Then, we have $r_{z_1}(u_m)_1 + r_{z_2}(u_m)_2 = 0$ on $b\Omega$, that is, $u_m \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^1 \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$. Moreover, we have

$$\|u_m\|^2 = 2(m+1) \int_\Omega |z_1|^{2m} \psi(|z_2|^2) dV \geq 2(m+1) \int_{D(0,1)\times D(0,\frac{1}{2})} |z_1|^{2m} dV \simeq 1 \tag{6.9}$$

On the other hand, one checks readily that $\bar\partial u_m = 0$ and $\bar\partial^* u_m = \sqrt{2(m+1)}\, z_1^m \partial_{z_2}\chi$; this yields $\|\bar\partial^* u_m\|^2 \lesssim 1$. In conclusion,

$$||u_m||_0 \simeq Q(u_m, u_m). \tag{6.10}$$

We remark now that, by H_0-boundedness, there must exist a convergent subsequence $\{u_{m_k}\}$. Since Ω is circular with respect to z_1, and since integration of $z_1^m \bar{z}_1^{\tilde m}$ over the circle is 0 unless $m = \tilde m$, then the sequence is orthogonal and therefore the limit must be 0. By the compactness of the embedding $H_{-1} \hookrightarrow H_0$, we conclude $||u_{m_k}||_{-1} \to 0$. This, in combination with (6.10), violates compactness.

$\square$

As for global regularity, there are several criteria which do not require compactness. The first is the so-called Condition (T) (cf. [CS01] p. 129). Under the choice of a defining function r of Ω and of a normal vector field $L_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} r_{\bar z_j} \partial_{z_j}$, this is expressed as follows. For any ϵ there is a vector field $T = T_\epsilon$, tangent to $b\Omega$ and whose component along $L_n - \bar L_n$ has uniformly positive lower bound, such that

$$|\langle [T, S], L_n \rangle|_{b\Omega}| < \epsilon \tag{6.11}$$

for any $S \in \mathbb{C} \otimes T\mathbb{C}^n$. We refer to [CS01] Theorem 6.2.1 for the proof that Condition (T) implies global regularity. An easy application of this result is

Proposition 6.5. *Let Ω be a Reinhardt complete, smooth bounded, pseudoconvex domain of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then, the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N_k on $(0,k)$-forms is exactly regular in Sobolev norms, that is*

$$\|N_k\alpha\|_s \leq C_s\|\alpha\|_s, \tag{6.12}$$

for $s \geq 0$ and all $\alpha \in H_s(\Omega)^k$.

Proof. The proof goes through Condition (T). Since Ω is Reinhardt, then in particular it is circular, that is, invariant under multiplication by $e^{i\theta} \in S^1$ and therefore $T := i\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} z_j\partial_{z_j} - i\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n}\bar z_j\partial_{\bar z_j}$, when restricted to $b\Omega$, is tangent to $b\Omega$. It is an easy exercice to check that in order that Condition (T) is fulfilled, it suffices to show that T is not complex tangential, that is,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} z_j\partial_{z_j}(r)|_{b\Omega} \neq 0. \tag{6.13}$$

If, instead, we have $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} z_j\partial_{z_j}(r)|_{b\Omega} = 0$ at some $z^o \in b\Omega$, then the vector $z^o - 0$ is orthogonal to $\partial r(z^o)$ and therefore, there are other points $z^1 \in \Omega$ such that $|z^1_j| > |z^o_j|$ for any j. Since Ω is Reinhardt complete, this is a contradiction which proves (6.13). Thus Condition (T) is verified and the proposition is proved.

□

The most general criterion for global regularity is due to Straube [S08].

Theorem 6.6. [Straube 08] *Let Ω be a smooth bounded pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$, r a defining function for Ω. Let $1 \leq k \leq n$. Assume that there is a constant C such that for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exist a defining function r^ϵ for Ω and a constant C_ϵ with*

$$1/C \leq |\nabla r^\epsilon| \leq C \qquad \text{on } b\Omega, \tag{6.14}$$

and

$$\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\left\|\sum_{ij=1}^{n}\overline{r^\epsilon_{z_i\bar z_j} r_{\bar z_i}}u_{jK}\right\|^2 \leq \epsilon(\|\bar\partial u\|^2 + \|\bar\partial^* u\|^2) + C_\epsilon\|u\|^2_{-1} \tag{6.15}$$

for all $u \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^k \cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$. Then the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N_k on $(0,k)$-forms is exactly regular in Sobolev norms.

We postpone to the next section a modified proof of Straube's theorem but first discuss of some examples. A general class of domains which enjoy global regularity are convex domains. They belong to the larger class of domains endowed with a plurisubharmonic defining function which also have global regularity (cf. e.g. [BS91]). Historically, this fact is proved by the aid of Condition (T). For the selfcontainedness of our exposition, we prefere to offer a proof which uses Straube's Theorem.

Theorem 6.7. [Boas-Straube 91] *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ admitting a defining function r that is plurisubharmonic on the boundary, that is, $\partial\bar\partial r(z) \geq 0$ for any $z \in b\Omega$. Then the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator N_k is exactly, globally regular for any $k \geq 1$.*

Proof. By Theorems 3.12 and 6.6, we only need to show that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a family $\{\Phi^\epsilon\}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} |\Phi^\epsilon| \lesssim 1 \\ \partial\bar\partial\Phi^\epsilon(u^\tau, u^\tau) \gtrsim \frac{1}{\epsilon}\big|\sum\limits_{ij=1}^{n} \overline{r_{z_i\bar z_j} r_{\bar z_i}} u^\tau_j\big|^2 \end{cases} \qquad \text{on } \ b\Omega \tag{6.16}$$

for any $u = \sum u_j d\bar z_j \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^1 \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar\partial^*)$.

We define $\Phi^\epsilon := \dfrac{r}{\epsilon}$. Since $\partial\bar\partial r|_{b\Omega} \geq 0$, then by Cauchy-Schwartz

$$\partial\bar\partial r(u^\tau, u^\tau)\partial\bar\partial r(\bar\partial r, \bar\partial r) \geq \left|\overline{\partial\bar\partial r(\bar\partial r, u^\tau)}\right|^2 = \left|\sum_{ij=1}^{n} \overline{r_{z_i\bar z_j} r_{\bar z_i}} u^\tau_j\right|^2 \quad \text{on } b\Omega. \tag{6.17}$$

Since $\partial\bar\partial(\bar\partial r, \bar\partial r)$ is bounded on $b\Omega$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\bar\partial\Phi^\epsilon(u^\tau, u^\tau) =& \frac{\partial\bar\partial r(u^\tau, u^\tau)}{\epsilon} \\ \gtrsim& \frac{\partial\bar\partial r(u^\tau, u^\tau)\partial\bar\partial r(\bar\partial r, \bar\partial r)}{\epsilon} \\ \gtrsim& \frac{1}{\epsilon}\left|\sum_{ij=1}^{n} \overline{r_{z_i\bar z_j} r_{\bar z_i}} u^\tau_j\right|^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{6.18}$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 6.7.

□

Example 6.1. *Let Ω be the domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ defined by $|z_1|^2+\zeta(z_1,z_2)-1<0$ where*

$$\zeta=\begin{cases}0 & \textit{if } |z_2|<\frac{1}{2},\\ 1 & \textit{if } |z_2|\geq 1,\end{cases}$$

where we also assume, as a general fact, that Ω is pseudoconvex. In this situation, according to Theorem 6.3, there is no compactness. However, global regularity can be achieved in several cases as for instance for

(i) $\zeta=\zeta(|z_1|,|z_2|)$ (so that Ω is Reinhardt) and ζ is decreasing with respect to both $|z_1|$ and $|z_2|$ (so that Ω is complete),

(ii) ζ is general but, for any vector $w\in\mathbb{C}^2$, it satisfies $|w_1|^2+\partial\bar\partial\zeta(w,w)\geq 0$ (so that Ω admits a plurisubharmonic defining function).

6.3 Weak compactness estimate and global regularity

The purpose of this section is to show that global regularity follows from an estimate which is weaker than compactness. The proof that we give is a variation of a Straube's [S08] result.

Theorem 6.8. *Let Ω be a smooth, bounded, pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Assume that for any positive constant $\epsilon>0$ there exists a defining function r^ϵ of Ω with $\sum\limits_k|r^\epsilon_{z_j}|^2\cong 1$ on $b\Omega$ such that*

$$\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\Big\|\sum_{ij}^{n} r^\epsilon_{z_i\bar z_j} r^\epsilon_{\bar z_i}\bar u_{jK}\Big\|^2\leq \epsilon\left(\|\bar\partial u\|^2+\|\bar\partial^* u\|^2\right)+C_\epsilon\|u\|^2_{-1}, \tag{6.19}$$

for any $u\in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^k\cap Dom(\bar\partial^*)$. Then the Bergman projection P_{l-1} is exactly, globally regular for any $l\geq k$.

Remark 6.9. We remark that Theorem 6.6 and 6.8 are equivalent. In fact, it is easy to check that (6.15) and (6.19) are equivalent; and by Boas-Strauble [BS90], N_k is exactly , globally regular if and only if P_{k-1},P_k,P_{k+1} are exactly, globally regular.

Before starting the proof, we need to fix some notations and state some preliminary result whose proof is immediate. Let U be a neighborhood of $b\Omega$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we may assume that the defining function $r := r^\epsilon$ of Ω satisfies $\sum_{k=1}^n |r_{z_k}|^2 \neq 0$ on U. We define a system of (1,0) vector fields by

$$N = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^n |r_{z_k}|^2} \sum_{k=1}^n r_{\bar{z}_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}, \quad T = N - \bar{N} \quad \text{and } L_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} - r_{z_j} N$$

for $j = 1, ..., n$. Notice that T and $L_j, 1 \leq j \leq n$, are tangential and that $\bar{T} = -T$.

First, we consider $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k$. Using integration by parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_j u\|^2 &\lesssim ([\bar{L}_j, L_j]u, u) + \|\bar{L}_j u\|^2 + \|u\|^2 \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_1 . \|u\| + \|\bar{L}_j u\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

Denote $\mathcal{S} = \text{span}\{L_1, ..., L_n, \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_1}, ..., \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_1}, Id\}$.

Proposition 6.10. *For $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}$, we have*

$$\|Su\|_{s-1}^2 \lesssim \|\bar{\partial} u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^* u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|u\|_{s-1} \cdot \|u\|_s, \tag{6.21}$$

and

$$\|u\|_s^2 \lesssim \|\bar{\partial} u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^* u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|u\|_{s-1} . \|u\|_s + \|T^s u\|^2, \tag{6.22}$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k \cap Dom(\bar{\partial}^*)$. Moreover, for $u \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)^k \cap Dom(\bar{\partial}^*)$, we have

$$\|u\|_{s+1}^2 \lesssim \|\bar{\partial} u\|_s^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^* u\|_s^2 + \|u\|_{s-1}^2. \tag{6.23}$$

Proof. The proof of (6.21) follows from the fact that

$$\|\frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{z}_j}\|_{s-1}^2 \lesssim \|\bar{\partial} u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^* u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|u\|_{s-1}^2 \tag{6.24}$$

for $j = 1, ..., n$, and

$$\|L_j u\|_{s-1}^2 \lesssim \|\bar{\partial} u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^* u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|u\|_{s-1} \cdot \|u\|_s, \tag{6.25}$$

for $j = 1, ..., n-1$. (The inequalities (6.24) and (6.25) may be found in [BS91], p.83 or in [CS01], Section 6.2.)

The proof of (6.22) follows by the induction in j from

$$\|T^j u\|_{s-j}^2 \lesssim \|\bar{\partial} u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|\bar{\partial}^* u\|_{s-1}^2 + \|u\|_{s-1} \|u\|_s + \|T^{j+1} u\|_{s-j-1}^2. \tag{6.26}$$

The last estimate (6.23) follows from ellipticity in the interior.

□

Lemma 6.11. *(i) We have*

$$[\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j}, T] = \theta_j T + S_j, \tag{6.27}$$

where $\theta_j = -\frac{1}{\sum\limits_k |r_{z_k}|^2} \sum\limits_i r_{z_i \bar{z}_j} r_{\bar{z}_i}$, *and* $S_j, \in \mathcal{S}$.

(ii) We also have

$$[\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j}, T^{2s}] = 2s\theta_j T^{s+1} + A_j^{2s-1} S_{j\,s}, \tag{6.28}$$

where A_j^{2s-1} *is a tangential differential operator of order* $2s-1$, *and* $S_{j\,s} \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proof. By differentiating and using formula $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} = r_{z_j} T + L_j + r_{z_j} \bar{L}_n$, we get the proof of the lemma.

□

Proof of Theorem 6.8. For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, we want to show by induction that P_l is exactly continuous on $H_s(\Omega)^l$ for $l = n-1, ..., k-1$.

We start from the remark that, when u has degree n, the condition $u \in \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$ coincides with the Dirichlet condition $u|_{b\Omega} \equiv 0$. Thus Q is elliptic on n-forms and hence $P_{n-1} = I - \bar{\partial}^* N_n \bar{\partial}$ is exactly continuous on $H_s(\Omega)^{n-1}$. The induction hypothesis is that P_k is exactly continuous on $H_s(\Omega)^k$. We need to show that P_{k-1} is exactly continuous on $H_s(\Omega)^k$ for any s.

We first prove that

$$\|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_s^2 \lesssim \|\alpha\|_s^2 + \|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_{s-1}^2 \tag{6.29}$$

for any $\alpha \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^{k-1}$. We have

$$(I - P_{k-1})\alpha = \bar{\partial}^* N_k \bar{\partial}\alpha \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^{k-1} \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*).$$

Using (6.22), for u replaced by $(I - P_{k-1})\alpha$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|(I - P_{k-1})\alpha\|_s^2 \lesssim& \|\bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* N_k \bar{\partial}\alpha\|_{s-1}^2 + \|(I - P_{k-1})\alpha\|_{s-1}^2 + \|T^s(I - P_{k-1})\alpha\|^2 \\ \lesssim& \|\alpha\|_s^2 + \|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_{s-1}^2 + \|T^s P_{k-1}\alpha\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{6.30}$$

Hence

$$\|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_s^2 \lesssim \|\alpha\|_s^2 + \|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_{s-1}^2 + \|T^s P_{k-1}\alpha\|^2. \tag{6.31}$$

Similarly, by using (6.21), we get

$$\|SP_{k-1}\alpha\|^2_{s-1} \lesssim \|\alpha\|^2_s + \|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_s \|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_{s-1} \tag{6.32}$$

for any $S \in \mathcal{S}$.

Now, we estimate the last term of (6.31). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T^s P_{k-1}\alpha\|^2 =&(T^s P_{k-1}\alpha, T^s\alpha) - (T^s P_{k-1}\alpha, T^s\bar\partial^* N_k \bar\partial\alpha) \\ =&(T^s P_{k-1}\alpha, T^s\alpha) - ((T^s)^* T^s \bar\partial P_{k-1}\alpha, N_k\bar\partial\alpha) \\ &- ([\bar\partial, (T^s)^* T^s] P_{k-1}\alpha, N_k\bar\partial\alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{6.33}$$

We set $\bar\theta_j = \sum_i r_{z_j\bar z_i} r_{\bar z_i}$ and define an operator $\bar\Theta : \mathcal{A}^{0,k-1} \to \mathcal{A}^{0,k}$ by

$$\bar\Theta u = \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-2} \sum_{i<j} \left(\bar\theta_i u_{jK} - \bar\theta_j u_{iK}\right) d\bar z_i \wedge d\bar z_j \wedge d\bar z_K.$$

We also define operators $\bar I_j : \mathcal{A}^{0,k-1} \to \mathcal{A}^{0,k}$ by

$$\bar I_j u = \sum_{|J|=k-1} u_J d\bar z_j \wedge d\bar z_J.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} [\bar\partial, (T^s)^* T^s] =&[\bar\partial, T^{2s}] + [\bar\partial, ((T^s)^* - T^s) T^s] \\ =&2s\bar\Theta T^{2s} + \sum_j A^{2s}_j S_j \bar I_j \\ =&2s(T^s)^*\bar\Theta T^{2s} + \sum_j (C^s_j)^* B^{s-1}_j S_j \bar I_j. \end{aligned} \tag{6.34}$$

where A^{2s-1}_j, B^{s-1}_j and C^s_j are tangential operators of order $2s-1$, $s-1$, and s respectively.

Thus, we can continue (6.33) by

$$\begin{aligned} =&(T^s P_{k-1}\alpha, T^s\alpha) - (\bar\Theta 2s T^s P_{k-1}\alpha, T^s N_k\bar\partial\alpha) + \sum_j (B^{s-1}_j S_j \bar I_j P_{k-1}\alpha, C^s_j X^s_j N_k\bar\partial\alpha) \\ \le&\epsilon\Big(\|P_{k-1}\alpha\|^2_s + \|N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2_s\Big) + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\Big(\|\alpha\|^2_s + \sum_j \|S_j P_{k-1}\alpha\|^2_{s-1} + \|\bar\Theta^* T^s N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{6.35}$$

Using the hypothesis of the theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar\Theta^* T^s N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2 \lesssim&\epsilon(\|\bar\partial T^s N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2 + \|\bar\partial^* T^s N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2) + C_\epsilon \|T^s N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2_{-1} \\ \lesssim&\epsilon(\|T^s\bar\partial N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2 + \|[\bar\partial, T^s] N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2 + \|T^s\bar\partial^* N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2 \\ &+ \|[\bar\partial^*, T^s] N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2) + C_\epsilon \|T^s N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2_{-1} \\ \lesssim&\epsilon(\|N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2_s + \|P_{k-1}\alpha\|^2_s + \|\alpha\|^2_s) + C_\epsilon \|N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2_{s-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.36}$$

where we are using, among other things, that $\bar\partial N_k\bar\partial\alpha = 0$. Combining (6.31), (6.35) and (6.36), we obtain

$$\|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_s^2 \lesssim \|\alpha\|_s^2 + \|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_{s-1}^2 + \sqrt{\epsilon}\|N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|_s^2 + C_\epsilon\|N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|_{s-1}^2. \tag{6.37}$$

We use now Boas-Straube's formula in [BS91]. For $\alpha \in H^s(\Omega)^{k-1}$ we have

$$N_k\bar\partial\alpha = P_k w_t N_{t,k}\bar\partial w_{-t}(I - P_{k-1})\alpha,$$

where $N_{t,k}$ is the solution operator to the weighted $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem with weight $w_t(z) = \exp(-t|z|^2)$. By the result of Kohn [K73], we have that $N_{t,k}\bar\partial$ is also exactly continuous on $H_s(\Omega)^{k-1}$. It follows

$$\|N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|_s \lesssim \|\alpha\|_s + \|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_s, \tag{6.38}$$

for any $\alpha \in H^s(\Omega)^{k-1}$. From (6.37) and (6.38), we get (6.29).

Finally, for any $\alpha \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^k$ we can write $\alpha = \chi_1\alpha + \chi_2\alpha$ where $\chi_1 \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar\Omega)^k$ and $\chi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)^k$ where U is a neighborhood of $b\Omega$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_s^2 &\lesssim \|P_{k-1}(\chi_1\alpha)\|_s^2 + \|P_{k-1}(\chi_2\alpha)\|_s^2 \\ &\lesssim \|\chi_1\alpha\|_s^2 + \|P_{k-1}(\chi_1\alpha)\|_{s-1}^2 + \|\chi_2\alpha\|_s + \|P_{k-1}(\chi_2\alpha)\|_{s-1}^2 \\ &\lesssim \|\alpha\|_s^2 + \|P_{k-1}(\chi_1\alpha)\|_{s-1}^2 + \|P_{k-1}(\chi_2\alpha)\|_{s-1}^2,\end{aligned} \tag{6.39}$$

for any $\alpha \in H^s(\Omega)^{k-1}$.

Since $\|\bar\partial^* N_k\bar\partial\alpha\|^2 = (\bar\partial^* N_k\bar\partial\alpha, \bar\partial^* N_k\bar\partial\alpha) = (\bar\partial\alpha, N_k\bar\partial\alpha) = (\alpha, \bar\partial^* N_k\bar\partial\alpha)$, then $\|P_{k-1}\alpha\| \lesssim \|\alpha\|$. We assume by induction that $\|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_{s-1}^2 \lesssim \|\alpha\|_{s-1}^2$ for any $\alpha \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^k$; then by (6.39), we get

$$\|P_{k-1}\alpha\|_s^2 \lesssim \|\alpha\|_s^2, \tag{6.40}$$

for any $\alpha \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)^k$. Using the method of elliptic regularization as in [KN65] and [FK72] the a priori estimate (6.40) becomes an actual estimate which yields the conclusion of the proof of Theorem 6.8.

□

Chapter 7

The Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ in some classes of domains

In this chapter, we rivisit classical estimates in the framework of the method of the weights and exhibit some new classes of domains which enjoy $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ Property. We also discuss about optimal subelliptic estimates.

7.1 Domains which satisfy the $Z(k)$ condition

In this section, we consider a domain satisfying the $Z(k)$ condition at a boundary point. This class of domains is probably the simplest of non-pseudoconvex domains which enjoy $\frac{1}{2}$-subelliptic estimates. We refer to [FK72] for the definition of this property which is also recalled here in 2.2.

Theorem 7.1. *A domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ satisfies $Z(k)$ condition at $z_0 \in b\Omega$ if and only if in a neighborhood U of z_0 the $\frac{1}{2}$-subelliptic estimate holds, that is,*

$$|||u|||^2_{1/2} \lesssim Q(u,u)$$

for any $u \in C^\infty_c(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k \cap Dom(\bar{\partial}^*)$.

This is a classical result about non-pseudoconvex domains that can be found in [H65], [FK72] and others. In this section, we give a new way to get $\frac{1}{2}$-subelliptic estimates by constructing a family of weights as required by Property $(f\text{-}\mathcal{M}\text{-}P)^k$ under the choice $\mathcal{M} = 1$.

Proof. Let Ω satisfy $Z(k)$ condition at $z_0 \in b\Omega$. Then Ω is strongly k-pseudoconvex or strongly k-pseudoconcave. There are a number $q_o \neq k$ and a neighborhood U of z_0 such that

$$\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1} r_{ij}u_{iK}\bar{u}_{jK}-\sum_{j=1}^{q_o} r_{jj}|u|^2 \gtrsim |u|^2 \text{ on } U\cap\bar{\Omega} \tag{7.1}$$

for any $u\in C_0^\infty(U\cap\bar{\Omega})^k\cap\mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$. So, what is left to show, is that Ω satisfies Property $(f\text{-}1\text{-}P)^k$ at z_0 with $f(\delta^{-1})=\delta^{-1/2}$.

We define $\Phi^\delta=-\frac{r}{\delta}$. For $z\in S_\delta$, we see that Φ^δ is absolutely bounded and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{q_o}^{\Phi^\delta}(u^\tau) \gtrsim &\delta^{-1}\left(\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}\sum_{ij=1}^{n-1} r_{ij}u^\tau_{iK}\bar{u}^\tau_{jK}-\sum_{j=1}^{q_o} r_{jj}|u^\tau|^2\right)\\ \gtrsim &\delta^{-1}|u^\tau|^2\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

Moreover, $L_j(\Phi^\delta)=0$ for any $j\le n-1$. Then the family $\{\Phi^\delta\}_{\delta>0}$ satisfies Property $(f\text{-}1\text{-}P)^k$.

□

Corollary 7.2. *Let M be a smooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Assume that M satisfies $Z(k)$ and $Z(n-1-k)$ condition at z_0. Then there is a neigborhood U of z_0 such that*

$$\|u\|^2_{b,1/2}\lesssim Q_b(u,u)$$

for any $u\in C_c^\infty(U\cap M)^k$.

The proof of Corollary 5.2 follows from Theorem 5.1 and Corolary 4.13.

7.2 q-decoupled-pseudoconvex/concave domains

Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{C}^n$ be defined in a neighborhood of z_0 by

$$r=2\mathrm{Re}z_n-a(z_1,\dots,z_{q_o})+b(z_{q_o+1},\dots,z_{n-1})<0 \tag{7.3}$$

where a and b are real functions such that $\partial\bar{\partial}a$ and $\partial\bar{\partial}b$ are ≥ 0.

Proposition 7.3. *The domain Ω, defined by* (7.3), *is (q_o+1)-pseudoconvex and (q_o-1)-pseudoconcave at z_0.*

Proof. We consider the basis of vector fields

$$L_i=\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}-r_{z_j}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_n}, j=1...n-1 \text{ and } L_n=\frac{\partial}{\partial z_n}.$$

Let $\omega_1,...,\omega_n=\partial r$ be the dual (1,0) forms of these vector fields. We may choose the Hermitian metric in which $\omega_1,...,\omega_n$ are orthonormal. Then

$$\partial\bar\partial r=-\sum_{ij=1}^{q_o}a_{ij}\omega_i\wedge\bar\omega_j+\sum_{ij=q_o+1}^{n-1}b_{ij}\omega_i\wedge\bar\omega_j$$

where a_{ij} and b_{ij} are the Levi matrices of a and b respectively. It follows, for any k-form u

$$H^r_{q_o}(u^\tau)=\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}a_{jj}|u^\tau|^2-\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{ij=1}^{q_o}a_{ij}u^\tau_{iK}\bar u^\tau_{jK}+\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{ij=q_o+1}^{n-1}b_{ij}u^\tau_{iK}\bar u^\tau_{jK}. \quad (7.4)$$

We prove now that $H^r_{q_o+1}(u^\tau)\geq 0$ for $k\geq q_o+1$, that is, that Ω is (q_o+1)-pseudoconvex. (The proof of the (q_o-1)pseudoconcavity of Ω is similar.) In fact, extending (a_{ij}) from a $q_o\times q_o$ to an $(n-1)\times(n-1)$ matrix by adding zeroes, and using the positivity of the resulting 2-form, we conclude

$$\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{i,j=1}^{q_o}a_{ij}u^\tau_{iK}\bar u^\tau_{jK}\leq\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}a_{jj}|u^\tau|^2.$$

It follows

$$H^r_{q_o}(u^\tau)\geq\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'\sum_{i,j=q_o+1}^{n-1}b_{ij}u^\tau_{iK}\bar u^\tau_{jK}. \quad (7.5)$$

Note that, $b\Omega$ being *rigid*, (7.5) holds not only on $b\Omega$, but also on $\bar\Omega$ near $b\Omega$.

□

Definition 7.4. Ω is said to be *q_2-decoupled-pseudoconvex* (resp. *q_1-decoupled-pseudoconcave*) at z_0 if there are functions $h_j(z_j)$ such that $b(z_{q_o+1},\dots,z_{n-1})=\sum_{j=q_2}^{n-1}h_j(z_j)$ (resp. $a(z_1,\dots,z_{q_o})=\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}h_j(z_j)$)

Remark 7.5. Since $\partial\bar\partial a$ and $\partial\bar\partial b$ are ≥ 0, then $\frac{\partial^2 h_j}{\partial z_j\partial\bar z_j}\geq 0$ for any j.

Remark 7.6. If Ω is (q_o+1)-decoupled-pseudoconvex then from (7.5) we get

$$H^r_{q_o}(u^\tau)\gtrsim\sum_{j=k}^{n-1}\frac{\partial^2 h_j}{\partial z_j\partial\bar z_j}\sum_{|K|=k-1}{}'|u^\tau_{jK}|^2\geq 0 \text{ on } U\cap\bar\Omega \quad (7.6)$$

for any u^τ of degree $k \geq q_o + 1$. On the other hand, if Ω is $(q_o - 1)$-decoupled-pseudoconcave, then, owing to $(b_{ij}) \geq 0$, we have

$$H^r_{q_o}(u^\tau) \underset{\sim}{>} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \frac{\partial^2 h_j}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_j}\big(|u^\tau|^2 - \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1} |u^\tau_{jK}|^2\big) \text{ on } U \cap \bar{\Omega}, \tag{7.7}$$

for any u^τ of degree $k \leq q_o - 1$.

Theorem 7.7. *Let Ω be $(q_o + 1)$-decoupled-pseudoconvex at $z_0 = 0$. Write coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^n$ as $z = x + iy$ and suppose that there are invertible functions F_j, $j = q_o + 1, ..., n - 1$, with $\frac{F_j(|t|)}{|t|^2}$ increasing with respect to t near 0 such that*

$$\textit{either} \quad \frac{\partial^2 h_j}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_j}(z_j) \underset{\sim}{>} \frac{F_j(|x_j|)}{x_j^2}, \quad \textit{or} \quad \frac{\partial^2 h_j}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_j}(z_j) \underset{\sim}{>} \frac{F_j(|y_j|)}{y_j^2} \tag{7.8}$$

Also, assume by reordering, that the Fj's are increasing, that is, $...F_j \lesssim F_{j+1}....$ Then $(f\text{-}1)^k$ estimates hold in degree $k \geq q_2$ with $f(\delta^{-1}) = (F_k^*(\delta))^{-1}$ where F_j^* are the inverse functions to the F_j's .

Similarly, let Ω be $(q_o - 1)$-decoupled-pseudoconcave and assume that there are F_j with $\frac{F_j(|t|)}{|t|^2}$ increasing in t and satisfying (7.8) for $j = 1, ..., q_o$; by reordering, further assume that $...F_j \underset{\sim}{>} F_{j+1}....$ Then $(f\text{-}1)^k$ estimates hold in degree $k \leq q_o - 1$ for $f(\delta^{-1}) = (F_k^*(\delta))^{-1}$.

Example 7.1. If $h_j(z_j) = |z_j|^{2m_j}$ or $|x_j|^{2m_j}$ with $m_j \geq m_{j+1}$, then we get ϵ-subelliptic estimates with $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2m_k}$. If $h_j(z_j) = \exp(-\frac{1}{|z_j|^{m_j}})$ or $\exp(-\frac{1}{|x_j|^{m_j}})$ with $m_j \geq m_{j+1}$, then we get $(f\text{-}1)^k$ estimates with $f(t) = (\log t)^{\frac{1}{m_k}}$.

Example 7.2. Let

$$r = 2\text{Re}z_n - a(z_1, ..., z_{q_o}) + \sum_{j=q_o+1}^{n-1} h_j(z_j).$$

where $\partial\bar{\partial}a \geq 0$ and $h_j(z_j)$ is defined in Example 7.1. Then we get $(f\text{-}1)^k$ estimates at z_0 for the domain $\Omega^+ = \{+r < 0\}$ (resp. $\Omega^- = \{-r < 0\}$) for any form of degree $k \geq (q_o + 1)$ (resp. $k \leq (n - q_o - 2)$). By Theorem 1.13 , $(f\text{-}1)^k$ estimates for the system $(\bar{\partial}_b, \bar{\partial}_b^*)$ on $M = \{r = 0\}$ hold in any degree k such that $q_o + 1 \leq k \leq n - q_o - 2$.

Proof of Theorem 7.7. We may assume that $\frac{\partial^2 h_j}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_j}(z_j) \underset{\sim}{>} \frac{F_j(|x_j|)}{x_j^2}$ for any j because, if $\frac{\partial^2 h_j}{\partial z_j \partial \bar{z}_j}(z_j) \underset{\sim}{>} \frac{F_j(|y_j|)}{y_j^2}$, we change coordinates by $z_j := iz_j$. Let C be a postive constant such that $C\frac{\partial^2 h_j}{\partial z_j\partial\bar{z}_j}(z_j)\geq\frac{F_j(|x_j|)}{x_j^2}$.

The case (q_o+1)-decoupled-pseudoconvex. For any form of degree $k\geq q_o+1$, we define the family of weights $\Phi=\Phi_k^\delta$ by

$$\Phi=C\frac{r}{\delta}-2\sum_{j=k}^{n-1}\exp(-\frac{x_j^2}{4F_k^*(\delta)^2}). \tag{7.9}$$

The weights Φ's are absolutely bounded on S_δ. Computation of the Levi form $\partial\bar\partial\Phi$ shows that

$$\partial\bar\partial\Phi=C\frac{\partial\bar\partial r}{\delta}+\frac{1}{F_k^*(\delta)^2}\sum_{j=k}^{n-1}\Big(1-\frac{x_j^2}{2F_k^*(\delta)^2}\Big)\exp(-\frac{x_j^2}{4F_k^*(\delta)^2})\omega_j\wedge\bar\omega_j.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}H^\Phi_{q_o}(u^\tau)=&\frac{C}{\delta}H^r_{q_o}(u^\tau)\\&+\frac{1}{F_k^*(\delta)^2}\sum_{j=k}^{n-1}\Big(1-\frac{x_j^2}{2F_k^*(\delta)^2}\Big)\exp(-\frac{x_j^2}{4F_k^*(\delta)^2})\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}|u^\tau_{jK}|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

Using (7.6) and the hypothesis (7.8), we get the estimate

$$\frac{C}{8}H^r_{q_o}(u^\tau)\geq\sum_{j=k}^{n-1}\Big(\frac{1}{\delta}\frac{F_j(|x_j|)}{x_j^2}\Big)\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}|u_{jK}|^2.$$

We use the notations

$$A_j=\frac{1}{\delta}\frac{F(|x_j|)}{x_j^2}\quad\text{and}\quad B_j=\frac{1}{F_k^*(\delta)^2}\Big(1-\frac{x_j^2}{2F_k^*(\delta)^2}\Big)\exp(-\frac{x_j^2}{4F_k^*(\delta)^2}).$$

where we notice that $A_j\geq 0$ for any j. Thus (7.10) reads as

$$H^\Phi_{q_o}(u^\tau)\geq\sum_{j=k}^{n-1}(A_j+B_j)\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}|u^\tau_{jK}|^2. \tag{7.11}$$

For each j wit $k\leq j\leq n-1$, we consider two cases
Case 1. If $|x_j|\leq F_k^*(\delta)$, we have

$$B_j\geq\frac{1}{2F_k^*(\delta)^2}e^{-1/4}\geq cF_k^*(\delta)^{-2};$$

and hence

$$A_j + B_j \gtrsim F_k^*(\delta)^{-2}.$$

Case 2. Otherwise, assume $|x_j| \geq F_k^*(\delta)$. Using our assumption that $\frac{F(|x_j|)}{x_j^2}$ is increasing in $|x_j|$, we get

$$A_j = \frac{1}{\delta}\frac{F_j(|x_j|)}{x_j^2} \geq \frac{1}{\delta}\frac{F_k(F_k^*(\delta))}{F_k^*(\delta)^2} = \frac{1}{\delta}\frac{\delta}{F_k^*(\delta)^2} = F_k^*(\delta)^{-2}.$$

In this case, B_j can get negative values; however, by using the fact that $\min\limits_{t\geq\frac{1}{2}}\Big\{(1-t)e^{-t/2}\Big\} = -2e^{-3/2}$ for $t = \frac{x_j^2}{2F_k^*(\delta)^2} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ we have

$$B_j \geq -2e^{-3/2}F_k^*(\delta)^{-2}.$$

This implies

$$A_j + B_j \gtrsim F_k^*(\delta)^{-2}.$$

Therefore, continuing our estimate (7.11), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} H_{q_o}^{\Phi}(u^\tau) &\gtrsim \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} F_k^*(\delta)^{-2} \sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1} |u_{jK}^\tau|^2 \\ &\gtrsim f(\delta)^2|u^\tau|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{7.12}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\sum\limits_{j=k}^{n-1}\sideset{}{'}\sum\limits_{|K|=k-1} |u_{jK}^\tau|^2 \geq \sideset{}{'}\sum\limits_{|J|=k} |u_J^\tau|^2 = |u^\tau|^2$. Moreover, we see that $\Phi_j = \frac{r_j}{\delta}$ and therefore $\Phi_j = 0$ for any $j \leq q_o$. Hence $\sum_{j=1}^{q_1+1} |\Phi_j u^\tau|^2 = 0$. Thus the weights $\Phi = \Phi_k^\delta$ satisfy Property $(f\text{-}1\text{-}P)^k$. Applying Theorem 1.10, we get

$$\|f(\Lambda)u\|^2 \lesssim Q(u,u)$$

for any $u \in C_c^\infty(U \cap \bar{\Omega})^k \cap \mathrm{Dom}(\bar{\partial}^*)$ with $f(\delta^{-1}) = F_k^*(\delta)^{-1}$.

The case q-decoupled-pseudoconcave. For each $k \leq q_o - 1$, we define the family of weights $\Phi = \Phi_k^\delta$ by

$$\Phi = C\frac{r}{\delta} + 2\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \exp\Big(-\frac{x_j^2}{4F_{k+1}^*(\delta)^2}\Big). \tag{7.13}$$

In the same way as before, we see that the Φ_k^δ's are absolutely bounded on S_δ and their Levi forms satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}H^\Phi_{q_o}(u^\tau) \gtrsim & F^*_{k+1}(\delta)^{-2}\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\Big(|u^\tau|^2-\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}|u^\tau_{jK}|^2\Big)\\ \gtrsim & F^*_{k+1}(\delta)^{-2}\Big((k+1)|u^\tau|^2-\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\sideset{}{'}\sum_{|K|=k-1}|u^\tau_{jK}|^2\Big)\\ \gtrsim & F^*_{k+1}(\delta)^{-2}|u^\tau|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{7.14}$$

Now, we need to show that

$$H^\Phi_{q_o}(u^\tau)\gtrsim\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{q_o}|\Phi_j|^2\Big)|u^\tau|^2. \tag{7.15}$$

We note that $\Phi_j=0$ for $k+2\le j\le n-1$ and that

$$|\Phi_j|^2=4F^*_j(\delta)^{-2}\Big(\frac{x_j^2}{2F^*_j(\delta)^2}\exp(-\frac{x_j^2}{2F^*_j(\delta)^2})\Big)\lesssim F^*_j(\delta)^{-2} \tag{7.16}$$

for $1\le j\le k+1$. Thus, from (7.14) and (7.16) we get (7.15).

□

7.3 Subelliptic estimates for regular coordinate domains

We state precise subelliptic estimates for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem over the class of *regular coordinate domains* of $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$.

We consider a domain $\Omega\subset\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ defined by

$$2\text{Re}z_{n+1}+\sum_{j=1}^n|f_j(z)|^2<0,\ \text{with } f_j \text{ holomorphic, } f_j=f_j(z_1,...,z_j) \text{ and } \partial^{m_j}_{z_j}f_j\neq0. \tag{7.17}$$

This is called a *regular coordinate domain*; the inequality which defines Ω is denoted by $r<0$. We discuss *subelliptic* estimates for the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem on Ω

$$|||u|||^2_\epsilon\lesssim||\bar\partial u||^2_0+||\bar\partial^*u||^2_0+||u||^2_0\quad\text{for any } u\in C^\infty_c(U\cap\bar\Omega)^1\cap\text{Dom}(\bar\partial^*). \tag{7.18}$$

Our problem is to find the *optimal* ϵ. There are several relevant numbers related to Ω

- $m = m_1 \cdot ... \cdot m_n$ the *multiplicity.*
- D the *D'Angelo type* defined as the maximal order of contact of a complex curve with $b\Omega$. Note here that since $\sum_j |f_j|^2 \underset{\sim}{>} |z|^{2m}$ then necessarily $D \leq 2m$.
- ϵ the (optimal) index of subelliptic estimates. It satisfies

$$\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{D} \text{ Catlin 1983 [C83]}, \qquad \epsilon \overset{?}{\geq} \frac{1}{2m} \text{ D'Angelo conjecture 1993 [D93].}$$

We define a new number γ. For this, we write

$$f_j = g_j(z_1, ..., z_j) + z_j^{m_j} + O(z_j^{m_j+1}) \quad \text{for } g_j = O(z_1^{\lambda_j^1}, ..., z_j^{\lambda_j^{j-1}}).$$

Let j_o, $j_o \geq 2$, $j \geq 2$, be the first index with the property that g_j is independent of z_j for any $j \leq j_o - 1$ and write l_j^i for the minimum between λ_j^i and m_i (resp. $m_i - \eta$ for any $\eta > 0$) when $i \leq j_o - 1$ and $j \leq j_o - 1$ (resp. $j \geq j_o$), and otherwise put $l_j^i = 1$. Define

$$\gamma_j = \min_{i \leq j-1} \frac{l_j^i}{m_j} \gamma_i, \qquad \gamma = \min_j \gamma_j. \tag{7.19}$$

Note that $\frac{1}{2m} \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} \leq \frac{1}{D}$. Here is our main result of [KZ08c] (which is also presented in [CC08] with $\frac{\gamma}{2}$ replaced by $\frac{1}{2m}$).

Theorem 7.8. *Let Ω be a regular coordinate domain and let γ be the number defined by* (7.19)*; then we have ϵ-subelliptic estimates for $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2}$.*

Example 7.3. For the domain of $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ defined by

$$2\text{Re} z_{n+1} + |z_1^{m_1}|^2 + \sum_{j=2}^{n} |z_j^{m_j} - z_{j-1}^{l_j}|^2 < 0, \quad l_j \leq m_{j-1} \leq m_j,$$

the number γ is given by $\gamma = \frac{l_2 \cdot ... \cdot l_n}{m_1 \cdot ... \cdot m_n}$. We claim that $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2} = \frac{1}{D}$. The first equality follows from Theorem 7.8. As for the second, we can easily find the *critical curve* Γ with the maximal contact with $\partial\Omega$; this is parameterized over $\tau \in \Delta$ by

$$\tau \mapsto (\tau^{\frac{1}{m_1 \gamma}}, \tau^{\frac{l_2}{m_2 m_1 \gamma}}, ..., \tau, 0).$$

In fact, we have $r|_\Gamma = |\tau^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}|^2 + |\cancel{\tau}^{\frac{l_2}{m_1 \gamma}} - \cancel{\tau}^{\frac{l_2}{m_1 \gamma}}| + ... = |\tau^{\frac{1}{\gamma}}|^2$ and therefore $D \geq \frac{2}{\gamma}$. On the other hand $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2} < \frac{1}{D}$ by Catlin 1983 [C83].

Example 7.4. For the domain in $\mathbb{C}^3$ defined by

$$2\text{Re}z_3+|z_1^4|^2+|z_2^6+\sum_{j=0}^{5}c_jz_2^jz_1^{\alpha_j}+O(z_2^7)|^2<0,$$

with $\alpha_j\geq 3$ for any j, we have $\gamma_1=\frac{1}{4}$, $\gamma_2=\frac{3}{6\cdot 4}$ and $\gamma=\gamma_2$.

Example 7.5. Let us consider in $\mathbb{C}^4$ the domain defined by

$$2\text{Re}z_4+|z_1^6|^2+|z_2^4+z_1^3|^2+|z_3^4+z_3z_1^a+z_3z_2^b|^2<0.$$

Here $\gamma_1=\frac{1}{6}$, $\gamma_2=\frac{3}{6\cdot 4}$ and $\gamma_3=\min(\frac{3\cdot b}{6\cdot 4\cdot 4},\frac{a}{6\cdot 4},\frac{3}{6\cdot 4})$ and $\gamma=\gamma_3$; in particular, if $a\geq 3$, and $b\geq 4$, we have $\gamma=\frac{3}{6\cdot 4}$.

Proof of Theorem 7.8.

In order to establish (7.18) it suffices to find a family of bounded weights $\{\Phi^\delta\}$ whose Levi form satisfies over the strip $S_\delta:=\{z\in\Omega:\ -r(z)<\delta\}$, the estimate $\partial\bar\partial\Phi^\delta(z)(u,\bar u)\underset{\sim}{>}\delta^{-\gamma}|u|^2$ for $u\in\mathbb{C}^n$. We choose $\alpha\geq 1$, put $\alpha_j=\alpha(m_{j+1}...m_n)$ and choose a smooth cut off function χ with $\chi\equiv 1$ in $[0,1]$ and $\chi\equiv 0$ in $[2,+\infty)$. We define

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^\delta=-\log(\frac{-r+\delta}{\delta})+&\sum_{j=j_o}^{n}\sum_{h=1}^{m_j-1}\frac{1}{|\log *|}\log\left(|\partial_{z_j}^hf_j|^2+\frac{\delta^{(m_j-h)\gamma_j}}{|\log\delta|^{(m_j-h)\alpha_j}}\right)\\&+c\sum_{j=1}^{n}\chi(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}})\log\left(\frac{|z_j|^2+\delta^{\gamma_j}}{\delta^{\gamma_j}}\right),\end{aligned}\tag{7.20}$$

where $*=\frac{\delta^{\gamma_j(m_j-h)}}{|\log\delta|^{(m_j-h)\alpha_j}}$; notice that $\log *\sim\log\delta$. The weights Φ^δ that we have defined are bounded in the strip S_δ. When calculating the Levi form, we observe that $\partial\bar\partial r(u,\bar u)=\sum_j|\partial f_j\cdot u|^2$ and $\partial\bar\partial|\partial_{z_j}^hf_j|^2(u,\bar u)=|\partial\partial_{z_j}^hf_j\cdot u|^2$ and finally $\partial\bar\partial|z_j|^2(u,\bar u)=|u_j|^2$. Thus, we have got a decomposition

$$\partial\bar\partial\Phi^\delta(u,\bar u)=\sum_{j=1}^{n}A_j+\sum_{j=j_o}^{n}\sum_{h=1}^{m_j-1}B_j^h+\sum_{j=1}^{n}C_j,\tag{7.21}$$

with the estimates

$$\begin{cases}A_j\underset{\sim}{>}\delta^{-1}|\partial f_j\cdot u|^2 & \text{for any } z\in S_\delta,\\ B_j^h\underset{\sim}{>}\delta^{-(m_j-h)\gamma_j}\frac{|\log\delta|^{(m_j-h)\gamma_j}}{|\log *|}|\partial\partial_{z_j}^hf_j\cdot u|^2 & \text{if } |\partial_{z_j}^hf_j|^2<\frac{\delta^{(m_j-h)\gamma_j}}{|\log\delta|^{(m_j-h)\alpha_j}},\\ C_j\underset{\sim}{>}c\delta^{-\gamma_j}|u_j|^2 & \text{if } |z_j|^2<\delta^{\gamma_j}.\end{cases}$$

We note that the A_j's and B_j^h's are positive for any z but, instead, the C_j's can take negative values when $|z_j| > \delta^{\gamma_j}$; however, $|C_j| \underset{\sim}{<} c\delta^{-\gamma_j}|u_j|^2$ and thus the C_j's are controlled by the A_j's and B_j^h's. We define

$$D_j = A_j + C_j \quad \text{for } j \leq j_o - 1, \qquad D_j = A_j + \sum_{h \leq m_j - 1} B_j^h + C_j \quad \text{for } j \geq j_o.$$

We wish to start by proving that, when $j \leq j_o - 1$, then

$$\sum_{i \leq j} D_i \underset{\sim}{>} \sum_{i \leq j} \delta^{-s_i\gamma_i}|z_i|^{2(s_i-1)}|u_i|^2 \text{ for any } s_i \leq m_i. \tag{7.22}$$

We use induction and show how to pass from step $j-1$ to step j (the step $j = 1$ being elementary). We fix our choice $s_i = l_j^i$ and remark that

$$\begin{aligned} A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i &\underset{\sim}{>} \delta^{-1}\left|\partial f_j \cdot u\right|^2 + \sum_{i \leq j-1} \delta^{-l_j^i\gamma_i}|z_i|^{2(l_j^i-1)}|u_i|^2 \\ &\underset{\sim}{>} \sum_{i \leq j-1} \delta^{-l_j^i\gamma_i}\left[|z_j|^{2m_j-1}|u_j|^2 - |z_i|^{2(l_j^i-1)}|u_i|^2\right] + \sum_{i \leq j-1} \delta^{-l_j^i\gamma_i}|z_i|^{2(l_j^i-1)}|u_i|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{7.23}$$

This proves (7.22) for $s = m_j$. On the other hand, we have

$$C_j + \delta^{-m_j\gamma_j}|z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} \underset{\sim}{>} (\delta^{-\gamma_j} + \delta^{-m_j\gamma_j}|z_j|^{2(m_j-1)})|u_j|^2. \tag{7.24}$$

This is clear for $|z_j|^2 \leq \delta^{\gamma_j}$; otherwise, C_j gets negative but it is controlled by the second term in the left of (7.24) for small c. By combining (7.23) with (7.24) we get (7.22) for $s = m_j$ and $s = 1$ and thus also for any $1 \leq s \leq m_j$. This concludes the proof of our claim (7.22).

We pass to treat the terms $D_j = A_j + \sum_h B_j^h + C_j \quad \text{for } j \geq j_o$. We begin by an auxiliary statement: if for some i with $j_o \leq i \leq j-1$ and for any $1 \leq s_{i'} \leq m_{i'}$, we have

$$\sum_{i' \leq i} D_{i'} \underset{\sim}{>} \delta^{-\gamma_i}|\log\delta|^{\alpha_i-1}|u_i|^2 + \sum_{j_o \leq i' \leq i-1} \delta^{-\gamma_{i'}}|u_{i'}|^2 + \sum_{i' \leq j_o-1} \delta^{-s_{i'}\gamma_{i'}}|z_{i'}|^{2(s_{i'}-1)}|u_{i'}|^2, \tag{7.25}$$

then we also have

$$\sum_{i \leq j} D_i \underset{\sim}{>} \delta^{-\gamma_j}|\log\delta|^{\alpha_j-1}|u_j|^2. \tag{7.26}$$

We prove the implication from step $j-1$ to j. By choosing $s_{i'} = l_j^{i'}$ in (7.25), and observing that, if $i \le j-2$, then $\delta^{-\gamma_i} \ge \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log\delta|^a$ for any a, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A_j + \sum_{i\le j-1} D_i &\underset{\sim}{>} \sum_{i\le j_o-1} \delta^{-\gamma_i l_j^i} \left(|\partial_{z_j} f_j|^2 |u_j|^2 - |z_i|^{2(l_j^i-1)} |u_i|^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i\ge j_o} \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log\delta|^{\alpha_{j-1}-1} \left(|\partial_{z_j} f_j|^2 |u_j|^2 - |u_i|^2 \right) + \sum_{i\le j-1} D_i \qquad (7.27) \\ &\underset{\sim}{>} \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log\delta|^{\alpha_{j-1}-1} |\partial_{z_j} f_j|^2 |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

If now $|\partial_{z_j} f_j|^2 \ge \frac{\delta^{(m_j-1)\gamma_j}}{|\log\delta|^{(m_j-1)\alpha_j}}$, then (7.27) can be continued by

$$\begin{aligned} &\ge \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}+(m_j-1)\gamma_j} |\log\delta|^{(\alpha_{j-1}-1)-(m_j-1)\alpha_j} |u_j|^2 \\ &\ge \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log\delta|^{\alpha_j-1} |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

If not, we pass to use B_j^1 instead of A_j. In this way we jump from $\partial_{z_j}^h f_j$ to $\partial_{z_j}^{h+1} f_j$ until we reach $B_j^{m_j-1}$; since $|z_j|^2 = |\partial_{z_j}^{m_j-1} f_j|^2$ is smaller than $\frac{\delta^{\gamma_j}}{|\log\delta|^{\alpha_j}}$ (otherwise we would have used the former term $B_j^{m_j-2}$), then $B_j^{m_j-1}$ is bigger than the right side of (7.26). This concludes the proof of the auxiliary statement.

We show that, for any value of $|z_j|^2$

$$\sum_{i\le j} D_i \underset{\sim}{>} \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2, \qquad (7.28)$$

whereas, when $|z_j|^2 \ge \delta^{\gamma_j}$

$$\sum_{i\le j} D_i \underset{\sim}{>} \begin{cases} \text{either} & \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log\delta|^{\alpha_j-1} |u_j|^2 \\ \text{or} & \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2. \end{cases} \qquad (7.29)$$

For $j \le j_o - 1$, the claim has already been proved in (7.22): the second alternative in (7.29) holds. If $|z_j|^2 \le \delta^{\gamma_j}$, then $C_j \underset{\sim}{>} c\delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$. Assume therefore $|z_j|^2 \ge \delta^{\gamma_j}$ and suppose (7.29) true up to step $j-1$; we prove that it also holds for j (which implies (7.28)). First, if in the inductive statement it is the first of (7.29) which is fulfilled at some step i with $j_o \le i \le j-1$, the first is also fulfilled at step j; this follows from the auxiliary statement. Otherwise, assume we have the second for any $i \le j-1$; (we surely do have for any $i \le j_o - 1$). Now, if for some $i \le j_o - 1$, we have $|z_i|^{l_j^i} \ge |z_j|^{m_j-1}$, or, for some $j_o \le i \le j-1$, we have $|z_i| \ge |z_j|^{m_j-1}$, then, owing to $|z_j| \ge \delta^{\gamma_j}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \delta^{-1} |z_i|^{2(m_i-1)} \ge \delta^{-\gamma_i l_j^i - \eta} |z_i|^{2(l_j^i-1)}, & i \le j_o - 1, \\ \delta^{-\gamma_{i-1}} |z_i|^{2(m_i-1)} \ge \delta^{-\gamma_i - \eta}, & i \ge j_o. \end{cases} \qquad (7.30)$$

To prove the second of (7.30), it suffices to notice that

$$\delta^{-\gamma_{i-1}}|z_i|^{2(m_i-1)} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{i-1}+\gamma_j(m_j-1)(m_i-1)} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_i-\eta}.$$

As for the first, we notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\delta^{-1}|z_i|^{2m_i-1} &\geq \delta^{-1+(m_i-l^i_j)\frac{m_j-1}{l^i_j}\gamma_j}|z_i|^{2(l^i_j-1)}\\ &\geq \delta^{-l^i_j\gamma_i-(\frac{m_i}{l^i_j}-1)\gamma_j}|z_i|^{2(l^i_j-1)} \geq \delta^{-l^i_j-\eta}|z_i|^{2(l^i_j-1)},\end{aligned}$$

(because $l^i_j \leq m_i - \eta$). This proves (7.30). By (7.30), the second of (7.29) is converted into the first in the inductive statement for $i \leq j-1$ (and thus also for j owing to the auxiliary statement). Thus the only critical case occurs when both the inequalities

$$\begin{cases}|z_i|^{l^i_j} \leq |z_j|^{m_j-1}, & i \leq j_o - 1,\\ |z_i| \leq |z_j|^{m_j-1}, & i \geq j_o,\end{cases} \tag{7.31}$$

are fulfilled. But we have in this situation

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_{z_j} f_j|^2 &\geq |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{j_o-1}|z_i|^{l^i_j-1} + \sum_{i=j_o}^{j-1}|z_i|^2\right)\\ &\geq |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)},\end{aligned}$$

which implies $A_j + \sum_i D_i \underset{\sim}{>} \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}}|z_j|^{2(m_j-1)}|u_j|^2$. This yields the second of (7.29). Thus induction works and brings us to step $j = n$. At this point we can disregard (7.29) (though it did a great job for the inductive argument): (7.28) for any $j \leq n$ yields the conclusion of the proof.

□

Bibliography

[A07] **H.Ahn**—Global boudary regulairy of the $\bar{\partial}$-equation on the q-pseudoconvex domains, *Math. Reich.* **280** (2007), 343-350.

[ABZ06] **H. Ahn, L. Baracco and G. Zampieri**—Non-subelliptic estimates for the tangential Cauchy-Riemann system, *Manuscripta Math.* **121** (2006), 461–479.

[ABZ07] **H. Ahn, L. Baracco and G. Zampieri**—Subelliptic estimates and regularity of $\bar{\partial}$ at the boundary of Q-pseudoconvex domain of finite type, preprint (2007).

[BS90] **H. P. Boas and E. J. Straube**—Equivalence of regularity for the Bergman projection and the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator, *Manuscripta Math.* **67** (1990) 25–33.

[BS91] **H. P. Boas and E. J. Straube**—Sobolev estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator on domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ admitting a defining function that is plurisubharmonic on the boundary, *Math. Z.* **206 (1)** (1991) 81–88.

[BS93] **H. P. Boas and E. J. Straube**— De Rham cohomology of manifolds containing the points of infinite type, and Sobolev estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem, *J. Geom. Anal.***3 (3)** (1993) 225–235.

[BS99] **H. P. Boas and E. J. Straube**— Global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem: A survey of the L2-Sobolev theory, in: M. Schneider, Y.-T. Siu (Eds.), *Several Complex Variables, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge,* 1999, pp. 79–111.

[C83] **D. Catlin**—Necessary conditions for the subellipticity of the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem, *Ann. of Math.* **117** (1983), 147–171.

[C84] **D. Catlin**—Global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem. *Complex analysis of several variables* (Madison, Wis., 1982),*Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.,* **41**, (1984), 39–49.

[C87] **D. Catlin**—Subelliptic estimates for the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains, *Ann. of Math.* **126** (1987), 131–191.

[CC08] **D. Catlin, and J.S. Cho**—Sharp estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem on regular coordinate domains, *arXiv:0811.0830v1* , (2008).

[Ch01a] **M. Christ**—Hypoellipticity in the infinitely degenerate regime, in *Complex Analysis and Geometry*, *Proc. Conf. Ohio State Univ.*, Walter de Gruyer, New York, 2001, 59–84.

[Ch01b] **M. Christ**—Spiraling and nonhypoellipticity, in *Complex Analysis and Geometry*, *Proc. Conf. Ohio State Univ.*, Walter de Gruyer, New York, 2001, 85–101.

[Ch02] **M. Christ**—Hypoellipticity of the Kohn Laplacian for three-dimensional tubular Cauchy-Riemann structures, *J. of the Inst. of Math. Jussieu* **1** (2002), 279–291.

[CS01] **S. C. Chen and M. C. Shaw**–Partial differential equations in several complex variables, *Studies in Adv. Math. - AMS Int. Press* **19** (2001).

[D82] **J. P. D'Angelo**—Real hypersurfaces, orders of contact and applications, *Ann. of Math.* **115** (1982), 615–637.

[D93] **J. P. D'Angelo**—Several complex variables and the geometry of real hypersurfaces. *Studies in Advanced Mathematics.* CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1993. xiv+272 pp.

[DF78] **K. Diederich** and **J. E. Fornæss**—Pseudoconvex domains with real-analytic boundary, *Ann. of Math.* **107** (1978), 371–384.

[DFH84] **K. Diederich; J. E. Fornæss and J. E.; Herbort**— G. Boundary behavior of the Bergman metric. *Complex analysis of several variables* (Madison, Wis., 1982), *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., 41, Amer. Math. Soc.* , Providence, RI, (1984) , 59–67.

[DK99] **J. P. D'Angelo** and **J. J. Kohn**—Subelliptic estimates and finite type, in *Several Complex Variables* (Berkeley, 1995–1996), *M. S. R. I. Publ.* **37**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (1999), 199–232.

[FK72] **G. B. Folland and J. J. Kohn**—The Neumann problem for the Cauchy-Riemann complex, *Ann. Math. Studies, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton N.J.* **75** (1972).

[FS98] **S. Fu and E. J. Straube**—Compactness of the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem on convex domains. *J. Funct. Anal.* 159 (1998), no. **2**, 629–641.

[FS01] **S. Fu and E. J. Straube**— Compactness in the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem.*Complex analysis and geometry* (Columbus, OH, 1999), *Ohio State Univ. Math. Res. Inst. Publ.*,**9**, de Gruyter, Berlin,(2001) , 141–160.

[GS77] **P. C. Greiner** and **E. M. Stein**—Estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem, *Math. Notes* **19**, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1977.

[H65] **L. Hörmander**—L^2 estimates and existence theorems for the $\bar{\partial}$ operator, *Acta Math.* **113** (1965), 89–152.

[H66] **L. Hörmander**—An introduction to complex analysis in several variables. *D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N.J.-Toronto, Ont.-London* 1966 x+208 pp.

[He07] **A. K. Herbig** — A sufficient condition for subellipticity of the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann operator. *J. Funct. Anal.* 242 (2007), **2**, 337–362.

[HMcN06] **A. K. Herbig and J. D. McNeal** — Regularity of the Bergman projection on forms and plurisubharmonicity conditions. *Math. Ann.* 336 (2006), **2** , 335–359.

[Ho85] **L. H. Ho**—Subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumman problem on the nonpseudoconvex, *Trans. AMS* **291** (1985), 43-73.

[Ho91] **L. H. Ho**—Subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumman problem for $n-1$ forms, *Trans. AMS* **325** (1991), 171-185.

[K64] **J. J. Kohn**—Harmonic integrals on strongly pseudoconvex manifolds, I, *Ann. Math.* **78** (1963), 112–148; II, *Ann. Math.* **79** (1964), 450–472.

[K65] **J. J. Kohn**—Boundaries of complex manifolds, *Proc. Conf. Complex Analysis*, (Minneapolis, 1964), Springer-Verlag, New York, 1965, 81–94.

[K72] **J. J. Kohn**—Boundary behavior of $\bar{\partial}$ on weakly pseudo-convex manifolds of dimension two, *J. Diff. Geom.* **6** (1972), 523–542.

[K73] **J. J. Kohn**—Global regularity for $\bar{\partial}$ on weakly pseudo-convex manifolds, *Trans. of the A.M.S.* **181** (1973), 273–292.

[K77] **J. J. Kohn**—Methods of partial differential equations in complex analysis,*Proceedings of Symposia in pure Mathematics* **30**(1977), 215–237.

[K79] **J. J. Kohn**—Subellipticity of the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains: sufficient conditions, *Acta Math.* **142** (1979), 79–122.

[K84] **J. J. Kohn**—Microlocalization of CR structures, *Proc. Several Complex Variables* (Hangzhou, 1981), Birkhauser, Boston, 1984, 29–36.

[K86] **J. J. Kohn**—The range of the tangential Cauchy-Riemann operator, *Duke Math. J.* **53** (1986), 525–545.

[K98] **J. J. Kohn**—Hypoellipticity of some degenerate subelliptic operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* **159** (1998), 203–216.

[K00] **J. J. Kohn**—Hypoellipticity at points of infinite type, in *Analysis, Geometry, Number Theory*: *The Mathematics of Leon Ehrenpreis* (Philadelphia, PA 1998), *Contemp. Math.* **251** (2000), 393–398.

[K02] **J. J. Kohn**—Superlogarithmic estimates on pseudoconvex domains and CR manifolds, *Annals of Math.***156** (2002), 213–248.

[Ke72] **N. Kerzman** —The Bergman Kernel Function. Differentiability at the Boundary. *Math. Ann.* , **195** (1972) 149 – 158.

[KN65] **J. J. Kohn** and **L. Nirenberg** —Non-coercive boundary value problems, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **18** (1965), 443–492.

[KR81] **J. J. Kohn** and **H. Rossi**—On the extension of holomorphic functions from the boundary of a complex manifold, *Ann. of Math.* **81** (1965), 451–472.

[Kr88] **S.G. Krantz**—Compactness of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator, *Proc. AMS* **103** n. 4 (1988), 1136–1138.

[Kr92] **S.G. Krantz**—Partial differential equations and complex analysis, *Studies in Advanced Mathematics.* CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1992. xii+297 pp..

[KZ08a] **T. V. Khanh and G. Zampieri**—Subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem on a weakly q-pseudoconvex/concave domain, *arXiv:0804.3112v* (2008).

[KZ08b] **T. V. Khanh and G. Zampieri**—Regularity of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann problem at a flat point, (2008)

[KZ08c] **T. V. Khanh and G. Zampieri**— Precise subelliptic estimates for a class of special domains, arXiv:0812.2560 (December 2008).

[KZ09a] **T. V. Khanh and G. Zampieri**—Compactness of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator on a q-pseudoconvex domain, to appear in *Complex Variables and Eliptic Equations* (2009).

[KZ09b] **T. V. Khanh and G. Zampieri**—Pseudodifferntial gain of regularity for solutions of the tangential $\bar\partial$ system (2008).

[McN02] **J. D. McNeal**— A sufficient condition for compactness of the $\overline{\partial}$-Neumann operator. *J. Funct. Anal.* 195 (2002), no.**1**, 190–205.

[McN92] **J. D. McNeal**— Lower bounds on the Bergman metric near a point of finite type. *Ann. of Math.* 136 (1992), **2,** 339–360.

[RS08] **A. S. Raich and E. J. Straube**—Compactness of the complex Green operator, *Math. Res. Lett.*, **15** n. 4 (2008), 761–778.

[S08] **E. J. Straube**—A sufficient condition for global regularity of the $\bar\partial$-Neumann operator, *Adv. in Math.* **217** (2008), 1072–1095.

[Sh85] **M. C. Shaw**—Global solvability and regularity for $\bar\partial$ on an annulus between two weakly pseudoconvex domains, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **291** (1985), 255–267.

[Z00] **G. Zampieri**—q-pseudoconvexity and regularity at the boundary for solutions of the $\bar\partial$-problem, *Compositio Math.* **121** n. 2 (2000), 155–162.

[Z08] **G. Zampieri**—Complex analysis and CR geometry, *AMS ULECT* **43** (2008).

Vita

TRAN VU KHANH
(Email : khanh@math.unipd.it; vukhanh83@yahoo.com)

Sept. 1983 :	Born, Ca Mau, Viet Nam.
2001-2005 :	Undergraduate student at Hochiminh University of Natural Sciences, Vietnam.
2006 :	Teaching assistant at Department of Mathematics and Computer Sciences, Hochiminh University of Natural Sciences, Vietnam.
2007-2009 :	Ph.D. student at University of Padova, Italy.